

Air Canada

say "reasons", but I will backtrack on that and say "some of his whatever that was". For example, he said that he believes in public ownership in areas which are vital, without giving any further definition, believing that that meant transportation.

I put to him a challenge: if he assumes that transportation is vital, and that therefore it ought to be publicly-owned, what does he say about the oil industry, about timber, about housing, about clothing, textiles and food? In other words, simply to say that because something is vital to a human being, it ought to be under public ownership is not enough; this covers far more than just the field of transportation. I think the hon. member would have to give that particular argument more substance than he has today.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I come from farming and ranching country, and we are not very happy when we see our beef filled with cereal. We call that filler, and I think that is what the last speech was. Instead of using cereal grains as filler, though, it was dandelion fuzz. The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge said that competition will not work. He said that in the essential services you need to have public ownership for reasons of efficiency. I should like to see him use that example in my riding, or indeed anywhere in Canada, and to say that the Post Office is the institution which is the epitome of efficiency in this country. I submit that virtually everywhere in Canada today the view is held that the Post Office, with its monopoly, does not demonstrate in any way the concept of efficiency.

The hon. member also said that we needed a monopoly in air transport because it is the government that builds the airports and the runways. To follow that argument through to its logical conclusion, we would have, as is the case in the Soviet Union, little cars with no style at all going across this country because the government builds the highways. In other words, he is saying that because the government builds part of a system, it ought to be owned by the government and there should be no private carriers. This would mean, in this country, that no individual could own a private car.

Then the hon. member said public ownership would avoid proliferation of the bureaucracy. That, Mr. Speaker, is when I noticed that you did up your safety belt. If he suggests to us that we should have public ownership in order to get rid of bureaucracy, it is evident he has done no reading at all about the last few years, what has happened to this government and what has happened to the bureaucracy within government agencies.

● (1652)

As the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) indicated, I should like to refer to some of the problems relating to the Edmonton international airport and the tremendous need to resolve the problems in that area. I noticed the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) rose today in an attempt to take some credit for the fact that a \$130 million airport terminal was built in Calgary and, therefore, presumably he had done something great for western Canada. It is interesting

[Mr. Malone.]

that the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Horner) could not ride in the same plane to the same city. They took two Jetstars out there, which is one example of inefficiency.

Mr. Max Ward, the president of Wardair, indicated that it was a pretty enough airport to look at, but they cannot afford the landing fees at that airport. There is a need for getting a system into place in order for the people of this country to have basic, efficient transportation, yet they build a marble hall for the Minister of Transport in order for him to be in a position to say, "I built this for the people of western Canada", regardless of the fact that it does not do justice or provide a service to the whole, integrated network of air transportation in this country.

Surely, Edmonton is one of the major cities of the prairies. As the gateway to the north, it should not have to suffer through the situation of two Jetstars sitting at the airport in Calgary, when paraplegics and invalids are required to go down two sets of steps in order to board an aeroplane in Edmonton, Alberta. If you come to Edmonton from other countries, you are literally herded into rooms which are as insufficient as cattle pens, while you are cleared through customs. The reason is that there are no facilities at that airport to handle people in a humane way. I do not say that in jest; I say it in all seriousness. The fact that when someone arrives in Edmonton and is required to take an invalid down two sets of stairs is simply an insult. As the president of Wardair said, it is a case of overbuilding in places like Mirabel and the Calgary international airport, while short-changing some other part of our country. That is unacceptable to us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point or order. It seems to me we are wandering quite far from the bill before us. Unless the House order was changed in my absence earlier this afternoon, we are debating whether to incorporate Air Canada on a different basis. As I understand it, we are not examining the estimates of the Department of Transport.

The hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Malone) was critical of the remarks of the preceding speaker, who was at least on the theme or the principle of the bill. The preceding speaker was dealing with the bill before us more adequately than the hon. member for Battle River and the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche). I share some of their concerns with respect to that airport, but surely they are completely out of order in making purely local representations on a bill which does not deal with that question. Surely it would be better dealt with in committee.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the intervention of the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. McIsaac). This intervention demonstrated that we touched a sore point. As he mentioned, he is aware of the inadequate facilities at the Edmonton international airport. Therefore, he did not want us bringing up that subject in the House of Commons, because he thought we should not embarrass the government about it. It is