

a Canadian Tory no idea was good unless it came from Great Britain. Now, to the twentieth century Tory no idea is good unless it comes from the United States. That is the gist of the Tory policy today. I suggest that Alberta is having more influence than normally on the Tory party. What functions for that country of more than 200 million souls to the south of us, with a set of very different historical circumstances, now dictates Tory policy, whether it is transportation or anything else.

However, I also thought of other Tory ideas when I heard the Leader of the Opposition. To have heard him speak you would never have thought that the Conservative party of Canada brought in Hydro as a public enterprise in Ontario, and you would never have thought that Bennett was the father of the central bank, the CBC and the Wheat Board. There was a time, I say in all seriousness, when the Conservative party of Canada did indeed recognize that, for a variety of historical reasons, the public sector was to be used not only as an inferior variant of the private sector but that it had a legitimate, important and independent role to play in the development of our country. Those days are gone, Mr. Speaker, because now for the Tories it is private enterprise all the way, as if the 100 years of history—including a good part of the history of the Conservative party—did not exist.

I listened with care to most of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition and I noted that there was no reference at all in it to the judgment which was handed down by the Canadian Transport Commission and to the argumentation which had been put forward by the very body which the motion put forward by the official opposition is calling into question. I find that, to say the least, passing strange. If you are going to deal with such an important and complex matter as transportation, it seems to me you should deal with the arguments that have been put forward in favour of the decision which you are opposing. However, I will return to that point in a minute. The reality is that the Conservative party is attacking the Air Canada takeover because it rejects holus-bolus any serious argument for the public sector in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: We should not be put off—I say that frankly to the Leader of the Opposition—by his passing comment that he seemed pleased to see Air Canada was making a profit, and he implied that the current Conservative policy presented no threat to Air Canada.

I want to quote the financial spokesman for the Conservative party, or at least one of their spokesmen because they vary from day to day. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) is normally thought to be the Conservative party's financial spokesman. This is what he said about Air Canada, and I think the people of this country, especially in regions which depend on Air Canada, should keep these words in mind. I quote from page 6020 of *Hansard* of May 27, 1977. It reads:

National Air Policy

—when successive news reports indicated the minister was investigating means of turning over Air Canada to private hands, we thought this would be the logical place to begin a constructive diminution of government control.

If that does not mean phasing out Air Canada, I do not know what it means. But just in case it was not clear, the financial spokesman for the Conservative party of Canada stated, as reported in *Hansard* two pages further on:

I suggest it is time to stop counting and to start subtracting.

He is talking about public enterprises. He went on to say:

It is time to begin divesting ourselves of some of these Crown corporations, rather than creating new ones.

He referred specifically to Air Canada.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Broadbent: So let us have no illusions about the Conservative party's position with regard to Air Canada because their financial spokesman, at least when he is speaking for the party, says they would like to get rid of it. The leader of the party, as is frequently the case, did not make his case clear at all. He made a passing reference to the possibility that the Tories would accept Air Canada. Let me emphasize that he did not say that, he made a passing reference to it, so the only explicit comment we have is from their financial spokesman, which is that they would get rid of Air Canada. That is where they stand.

I want to return to our arguments, which will be positive and in favour of Air Canada's action, but I cannot forgo this opportunity to make two central points. The Conservative party of Canada is now rejecting its own historical commitment to the independent need for public enterprise in certain sectors and is now trying to come down on both sides of the fence in this debate, pretending, on one hand, that it is for Air Canada, and on the other hand, that it is not. You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): You are right, for a change.

Mr. Broadbent: The Liberals are cheering. Now I am going to turn to them. If we think the Conservative party is presenting us with some problems in understanding where they really stand, what about the government of the day?

Mr. Woolliams: I knew you would come to them.

Mr. Broadbent: As I said, until August 1 there was a pretence, if I understood the Liberals at all, that they did believe, perhaps reluctantly, in a mixed economy and that they would use public enterprise, if necessary, but not necessarily public enterprise, and they would grudgingly do certain things.

Certainly since August 1 the spirit of R. B. Bennett has drifted up from his grave and moved out not only into the shadow cabinet but right across the chamber to take over entirely the Government of Canada. It is privatization with a small "p" on the part of the Tories, but if Your Honour will excuse the expression, it is a big "P" when applied to the Government of Canada. We have no policy at all which