

Government Orders

Also, I am appalled that he would suggest that the sky would fall because the airports are being transferred for their operation into a local airport authority. He treats it as if it has been privatized and sold to an agency. That is not the case.

He also questions the number of airport authorities that are possibly on the horizon. The member has failed to realize that, when this was announced many months ago by the former Minister of Transport, it was seeking those communities that would show interest in operation of the airports. To date, four such groups have come through: Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, and Montreal.

As to question of the number of possible transfers for operations, that is why there is such a small number.

He refers to the kiosks in airports. It just so happens that these kiosks happen to pay commissions to whatever airport they are in as a form of rent. I realize the NDP is not too concerned about whether it costs the taxpayers money to operate things and that, but this is one way of helping to recover some of the money.

• (1750)

Why does the member portray it as privatization, when it is not privatization? It is the transfer of the operation of the airport and the safety aspects of the comptrollers, the operation of the things from the tower, et cetera, still are completely under the auspices of Transport Canada and will not be under the airport authority.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I was only responding to comments made by the minister. I have read the bill. My surprise is whether or not the minister has read it, judging by his remarks on it. If the member opposite is worried about whether or not I have read it, I certainly have.

The minister is the one who referred to the better service, to the cost efficiency, to the more effective commercial operation of the airports, and the entrepreneurial potentialities of it. If those relate in any specific way to, as the bill is entitled, "an act to provide for certain matters respecting official languages, employees' pensions and labour relations in connection with the transfer of certain airports", I am at somewhat of a loss to explain how it does.

As I said, it certainly gave me an opportunity to be able to make reference to what I consider to be the four pillars of the Conservative philosophy: deregulation, privatization, and free trade, and another free trade.

With all due respect to the member who asked me the question, and with all due respect to my desire to stand up here and keep on talking, we could go on about deregulation, privatization and so on. There are members who wish to speak. On that basis, I would be only too pleased to sit down to let them have some time.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate this opportunity to speak to Bill C-85, even though I have but eight minutes today, unless you are prepared to be friendly and extend the—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member has seven minutes.

Mr. Nunziata: Seven minutes? Aren't you kind, Mr. Speaker. I will speak for seven minutes and resume my comments next day.

We on this side of the House are concerned about this piece of legislation. It is one small step in the long journey that the Prime Minister and the Conservative Party embarked upon in 1984 to sell out the country. The Conservative Party and the Prime Minister, starting in 1984 decided to put Canada out of business. In other words, they decided to privatize different federal institutions and different federal Crown corporations in order to satisfy the right wing element of the Conservative Party.

Is it any wonder that Mr. Spicer and others have to travel from one end of the country to the other to deal with national unity when this government six years ago started to pull apart the country? It started to divide the country because of its policies and, in particular, its policy with respect to privatization.

The federal government has a role to play in order to keep this great nation together because, without the federal government and without federal government policies, the only thing that binds Canadians and the only thing that we would have in common is the fact that we share the northern half of North America. It is the only thing we would have in common. What else would a potato farmer in Prince Edward Island and a forest worker in British Columbia have in common?