

*Transportation*

between that and the sea shall, unless it has been by its shippers specifically routed otherwise, be exported through Canadian seaports.

As the senior member for Halifax has pointed out—and I am sure he will bring it to the minister's attention again early in the new year—we would like to know whether this policy will be continued and what guarantee the bill may contain to ensure that this is done.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Will the hon. member let me repeat what I said yesterday in this regard? It is my intention to propose an amendment when we reach the appropriate place in the bill to the effect that every advantage as to rates or routing now enjoyed by the Atlantic ports by any law now in effect will continue to be in effect notwithstanding anything in this bill. Of course, these are not the actual words which I used, but the sense.

**Mr. Forrestall:** I thank the minister for that statement. I accepted it yesterday with the hope that the minister might go a little further and specifically spell out the form of the port parity policy.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Does the hon. gentleman not think that we ought to allow these experts, to whom we are paying a considerable sum of money, to make proposals to us next March for general improvements in the Atlantic region and in this way earn their pay rather than try to anticipate their conclusions?

**Mr. Forrestall:** Not at all, Mr. Chairman. I am not at all sure what it is they will do, and as a maritimer in whose constituency lies the port of Halifax I am not about to accept in principle a pig in a poke. I have greater confidence in what the minister is able to tell the House of Commons during the next two or three weeks. I would far sooner accept that, and hope that the special study which is being conducted will take due note of the minister's responsible directions. After all it is Christmas time; perhaps the minister could at least indicate to us that this is a matter close to his heart and is receiving his fondest, warmest and most charitable consideration.

Mr. Chairman, in most respects the bill accommodates railway transportation. At a later stage I will make one or two comments about the facilities in the port of Halifax, but at this point I would like to say a few words on the hearings of the committee with regard to the broad scope of the bill. I suggest to the minister that it was regrettable, not only to me but

[Mr. Forrestall.]

I am sure to many others in the chamber that during the course of the hearings briefs and papers were not encouraged, or indeed invited—maybe there was not enough time—from various segments of our air transportation industry. I refer to our main line domestic and international carriers, to our regional air carries, but more specifically to the aviation field in general, the charter companies.

● (5:10 p.m.)

If you would review, Mr. Chairman, some of the national statistics relating to class 4 air carriers you would find that they are performing a role in Canada, the absence of which would indeed impose very strong hardship on vast segments of our rural and northern life.

It seems to me that on a bill of this magnitude, which sets out to reshape the administrative responsibilities for all forms of transportation in Canada, the committee not only could have but should have set aside at least two or three hearings for the purpose of exploring views of our main line carriers as well as the smaller regional and charter companies.

For example, Mr. Chairman, domestic policy, which still falls within the purview of the air transport board, has suffered from change, innovation, amendment and goodness knows what else for so long now, without any proper public exposition of this policy, that it is not only regrettable but quite lamentable that some occasion has not been provided the air transport industry within the recent weeks to put forward their positions. I think the government should have taken the lead in the matter and invited, indeed encouraged, their representatives to come before the committee. The fact that this has not been done will, I hope, not prevent the minister in any way from pursuing this question at some stage early in the new year.

Most of us welcomed his position paper on regional air policy. We found in it some most meaningful and helpful directional instruments. But this is just one segment of air policy; there are at least two others, possibly three, deserving of and requiring similar attention. It seems to me that this was the time this attention should have been given.

For example, Mr. Chairman, we should be looking at the adequacy of our air terminals, runways, refuelling facilities, passenger handling capacities and distances from airports to urban centres. Problems in air traffic control still exist. But the whole spectrum of flying has been ignored in the sense that none of the industry's representatives in this field participated in the committee hearings which