

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for St. John's East. You have one minute.

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate that restriction.

**An hon. member:** Being set up.

**Mr. Reid:** There is so much to say and so little time to say it. I appreciate what my friend opposite says. I think it is important that we recognize this. I said in my remarks that it is important for us to phase in some of these changes, that we take this in a slow and deliberate manner.

Obviously to totally open the doors and say: "Anybody can fly anywhere they like" is not a solution for our carriers. I would suspect and suggest it is not a solution for American carriers, and we are not about to see that. This is a process of negotiation, a process that takes some time and depends on the local management of the airports. As you know, in the United States, in some cases they manage their airports differently than we do, and there are airports in this country that want to be managed the same way.

I would answer the question more completely, but the Speaker is telling me my time is gone.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Before resuming debate, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River—Member of the Senate; the hon. member for Cardigan—Goods and Services tax; the hon. member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt—Goods and Services Tax.

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan.

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, just before I do, on a point of order, if I may? During the last question and comment round, you, Sir, chose to go to two members of the Official Opposition. I realize that you are still in an on-the-job training, if you like—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Some hon. members:** Boo. Boo.

**Mr. Angus:** It has been a practice in this House to try to attempt to distribute those questions.

I am pleased to contribute to the debate on Bill C-85. I must say that I listened with great interest to the comments from the member for St. John's East. I would have wished to have asked him to perhaps revisit his statistics. He talked about the increase in flights serving the various communities.

• (1700 )

I would like to point out that if you trade in a jet with 90 seats or 120 seats, or whatever the big ones carry, for a couple of little jets that carry 12, you are going to have a lot more frequency of landings and take-offs, but you are not going to have much in the way of difference, if not a loss, in terms of the number of actual seats available from community to community. I wish I would have had the opportunity to hear the member's response to that.

I did not hear much of the debate about the specifics of the bill during the last member's comments, nor even did I hear much of it or read much of it in the minister's comments or those of the Liberal opposition member who tended to talk about deregulation and open skies and privatization.

This bill is a bill to provide some protection for those employees who will be affected by the government's policy to turn over the operations of components of our airports. I wish we were debating a piece of legislation that establishes the policy for the devolution of those airports so that we in this House and the people across Canada could participate in the whole question of who should be running airports; not on the air side—and I think that is clear; even the government is saying it will continue to operate them—but the buildings and the land. Should they be a component of the Government of Canada, directly owned and operated on behalf of the taxpayers? The government is saying that it is not going to give up ownership. It is going to regain the ownership of the land and the buildings, but it wants someone else to manage them.

This started, not in 1987 as the minister indicated in his comments, but back in May of 1985 with the Nielsen report, the program review task force, which was the first to propose under the Conservative regime that the federal government consider changing its airport policy "to one of non-federal ownership and operation". Obviously it has gone away from the non-ownership to just operation.