

Transportation

Mr. Lang: The hon. member ignores the billions of dollars in the grain handling and transportation system. He says I should butt out of the Prince Rupert situation. I am really amazed at the hon. member, who I think is the only living Albertan left who thinks that Casey Point is the place to put a terminal. It is true that a spokesman for BCDC still says so, although the British Columbia government has agreed with us that the right place for the terminal is Ridley Island. But they do not agree with their own development corporation. The governments of Alberta, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan agree with us that Ridley Point is the place to put our grain terminal, such as we are suggesting be put in Prince Rupert. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Because the moment we started talking about a new grain terminal at Prince Rupert of ten million bushel capacity plus 20 million bushel surge, there was no possibility of building that kind of terminal at Casey Point; but the hon. member wants us to go back and build it there.

Of course, if the people in the elevator consortium wanted to go ahead with that kind of construction, it would be perfectly open for them to do so and nothing would stand in their way. But in fact what they want are certain arrangements with regard to Prince Rupert which we are pursuing and which do in fact involve our active participation. The hon. member praises the government of Alberta. It is true that they offered to lend them \$100 million if that were needed. It is made to sound as if it was great largesse, but, after all, with the heritage fund around, they are looking for people to whom to lend anyway. I am not sure how great an act that was, but let that lie and let the hon. member understand that it was not as great an act and that the really important act is still to come.

What I want the hon. member to know is that I believe firmly that we will be moving forward with the Prince Rupert terminal, and I want him to know as well that, as in the past, we will be ensuring that the grain system for handling that grain, the whole rail system, and the rail system for handling all the other thousands and thousands of tonnes of products, will be put in place. The hon. member ignores the fact that the two major railways in this country have been continuing to expand significantly their capacity to handle potash, coal and sulphur as well as grain, and that they have been doing it as a result of the encouragement to ensure that the necessary capacity was there. For instance, the necessary cash flow for the Canadian Pacific to go ahead with major improvements in the Rocky Mountains, to virtually double track certain stretches and to eliminate the last of the steep grades, results from two specific measures for improved tax arrangements for the corporation in the two recent budgets which have allowed them to have the cash flow to go ahead with these improvements.

That is an example of the kind of foresight we have had in ensuring that transportation would benefit in all parts of this country. In the Atlantic provinces we can take a look at the ferry services and at the improvements there in terms of new vessels put on stream and new management put in place as we move toward more sensible transportation and action.

[Mr. Lang.]

Our air policy has produced strong airlines and will produce stronger ones. The hon. member is not able to understand all of the complexities of strengthening regional airlines, but I want him to know that I do not think the people most directly involved in the management of those regionals have the kind of doubts and worries he has. I want him to know that they have no such worries, in part because of our regular meetings together on airline matters and on what needs to be done to make the airline service in this country more effective.

When it comes to Canadian travel, we encourage the development of every possible lower fare that the airlines can put forward. We asked the Canadian Transport Commission to review its charter regulations and to relax them in order to allow for more charters. They did so to some extent, and when they did not do as much as we thought they should, we altered their decision and allowed for more charters. We encouraged the main airlines to offer charter competitive fares. The delightful thing about those is that they are available between all kinds of different points in the country, not just between the major cities which the key charter operations alone would serve, and that is important. But we are not satisfied to rest there; we are going ahead working and waiting for the additional changes in the regulations which will allow that to happen. We do not treat it either as though it were a simple thing.

The hon. member for Vegreville has expressed the Tories' approval for deregulation. It is interesting that again here Tories in opposition agree with the current American wave of deregulation, but Tories in government, in Ontario, for instance, or in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland or Manitoba—

Some hon. Members: Go on.

Mr. Lang: —have not moved to deregulate their trucking industry. The trucking industry is one of the most regulated industries. Do the Tories in power take action to deregulate the industry? No. But of course, Tories do not necessarily need consistency from one part of the country to the other, from one day to the next. They do not need consistency because they are trained for the opposition. They know how to do the opposition job in one way in one part of the country and in another way in another part of the country, and that is where they should stay. However, they have not quite kept up to their traditions by allowing what they say to be heard. They have had to reverse themselves, as is their new tack these days. Today it is this, tomorrow that. They will negotiate sovereignty-association, and then they will not negotiate sovereignty-association.

Some hon. Members: Four-fifths.

Mr. Lang: Then they attack the deficit. They say that deficits are bad for this country. We have heard that time and time again. Except I must admit that at every budget it seems to me they have one spokesman saying that another \$1 billion would be exactly right and another spokesman saying that another \$1 billion less would be exactly right. The hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) and the hon. member for