

Aeronautics Act

own point of view in respect of what the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre said, I do not—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that we are now getting into a point of debate.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member should stick to jails. At no time did I mention anything about Cranbrook. That will be coming out at a later date, and he can be sure of that.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, nothing is to be done about this serious problem regarding unlicensed flight engineers until July 1, 1978. I am calling upon the parliamentary secretary, because I understand the Minister of Transport if over in Hawaii, to take immediate action to get these flight engineers licensed. Never mind waiting until July 1, 1978. The government's main concern seems to be with the legal aspects. I am quite sure the hon. member has updated his driver's licence and the insurance on his home. I do not think he would let that lapse for six months, and neither would I.

This document to Air Canada also points out that the present employees assigned to flight engineer duties will have until October 1 to comply. This is absolutely ridiculous. This is a matter that was identified over two years ago, but there has been stalling, covering up and nothing done. These are unlicensed people. I am worried about the flying public while the government is worried about the legal aspects. I suggest to the parliamentary secretary that he talk to senior officials of MOT to get the proper procedure in place, and have present flight engineers fully licensed today, not next October.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his allotted time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, the first thing I should like to say is that I am sorry the hon. member for Winnipeg South was not permitted to continue his remarks.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Malone: I think it of importance to hon. members on the government side to have the opportunity of listening to the remarks of that hon. member. Obviously the reason for the shouting of "no" was that they were beginning to hear some information they felt they did not want to face up to. They were hearing information about their government—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order please. I suggest to the hon. member that he get back to the subject for discussion, Bill C-4.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about Bill C-4. The hon. member who preceded me was talking about Bill C-4. Members across the way were responding in respect of Bill C-4. I simply want to say that members opposite were hearing something embarrassing to the government in respect of Bill C-4. Perhaps they should read *Hansard* to see what the member was saying. He was giving information which would indicate that, unless this government takes corrective action, it will find itself facing political embarrassment, because it is obvious the government was trying to save its political skin at the risk of people's lives. The government has failed to put into effect the kind of legislation and action that would avoid those violations of air safety regulations that have occurred. Instead we have been left with haphazard chance, as documented in detail by the hon. member for Winnipeg South.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Malone: Winnipeg South Centre, I am sorry. I will have some questions to put tomorrow.

● (2032)

I find it somewhat appalling that we are still debating the amendment at this time because I think it would be a simple task for members on the government side to recognize that what we are asking is for a committee to deal with the matter if something extraordinary or irregular takes place with regard to air safety or air traffic. It seems to me that this is a prerogative of parliament. When we view the heavy handed and hard nosed reaction to legislation which is before the country today, it seems to me appropriate for hon. members opposite to let us go forward with the amendment on report stage and then give the bill third reading.

When we see that on the average this government has ten orders in council to consider each day and the cabinet meets but once a week, this means they must consider some 70 orders in council a week. Since we know that they receive 3,500 orders in council a year, it soon becomes apparent that what the minister is trying to do through Bill C-4 is to grasp even more regulatory powers in ministerial hands without giving parliament an opportunity to decide. That kind of action thwarts the whole process of parliamentary democracy. The government asks for more power to be given to the cabinet and less power to the representatives of the people who are elected to voice the will of the people all across this land.

The amendment merely asks that the consultation process take place and that there be legitimate parliamentary review. There is no just cause for not accepting it. I dare members on the opposite side to have the courage to be true parliamentarians. Let them prove that there is harm or some evil associated with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). If they cannot establish that there is something wrong with the amendment, let them simply allow us to pass it and to proceed to third reading of the bill.

Bill C-4 to amend the Aeronautics Act gives the minister increasing and arbitrary powers to impose the user-pay con-