

down the road we will have to go full circle for the third time since 1867 to bring back a regulated regime. If you want to persuade me not to run again, withdraw this legislation and I will consider it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Thacker: Is that a promise? Can we get that in writing?

Mr. Benjamin: In Motion No. 4 along with Motion No. 3, although the Speaker feels that they should be debated separately and voted on separately, we are at least presenting two alternatives to the Government to make this Bill in its basic thrust, as bad a Bill as it is, less bad. We hope that the Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary or somebody over there will get up and so indicate. If they want to indicate ahead of time how many of these amendments of ours they think are good—I know they think a lot of them are good—and are acceptable, we could probably get through this Bill a lot quicker. If government Members are going to be stubborn, mean, difficult and ornery, they leave us no choice but to present every motion as sincerely and as strongly as we can.

In the course of opposing we are proposing and hopefully, we will be able to persuade.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Madam Speaker, I had hoped to hear a government Member explain to this House why the Government does not want this kind of protection. Why does the Government not want to put a proviso that each carrier or mode of transportation establishes and maintains fares, rates and conditions that do not constitute unfair or destructive competitive practices? Why is the Government not coming forward and saying, "Of course, we want to protect them. We want to provide that protection". There is no movement at all. In fact, I heard a call for the question, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Belsher: We did our homework in committee. You were there.

Mr. Angus: The Hon. Member makes reference to doing our homework in committee. I want to remind him that we were not given the amount of time that we originally wanted.

Mr. Belsher: Now, now.

Mr. Angus: I want to be accurate by saying that in order to get travel outside of Ottawa, the limited travel that we did, it was an all-Party agreement—

Mr. Belsher: Right.

Mr. Angus: —to report by a certain date. That would not have been necessary if the Government were really confident in this Bill being accepted by the people of Canada. The Government wanted to get it through fast. Once we finally got it to committee stage, it took the Government forever after it was tabled to get it into the House for discussion. That says more about the manner in which the Government is controlling

its own affairs than anything else. If the Government were that concerned about us doing our homework, we would have had more than two days to do clause by clause study. We would have had more than a partial to a full day with the Minister to go through the philosophical matters. Quite frankly, we were rushed. My colleagues and I are trying to correct some of those things we may have missed.

• (1750)

The Hon. Member made a reference to filibustering. I can assure him that we have no such intention whatsoever. I will be the last speaker for my Party on this clause. We are being very conscientious. Quite frankly, we learned the hard way during the debate on the WGTA. Before we had gotten anywhere near the end of our list of motions, the Liberal Government of the day brought in closure and many of our amendments were not dealt with.

We want to present our case in a very responsible way. We want to encourage the Government to reconsider some of its positions, and then we want to move on to other motions. There are many motions before us and we want to get through them before we complete our work on this Bill.

As my colleague, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), said, we are trying to improve this Bill. Through the policy part of the Bill, we are trying to say that we feel that competition should be, where feasible, the prime agent in providing viable and effective transportation services. The House will recall my comments on Motion No. 3. I said that there are areas in Canada where competition does work, where market forces do compress prices and push up the quality of service. However, there are also areas in what I like to refer to as the near-North for which this is not true.

The near-North is not included in the exemptions found elsewhere in the Bill. Communities in that narrow band along the Canada-U.S. border and relatively close to the northern borders of the prairie provinces above which there is some form of continued regulation will be affected by this legislation. I am not talking about Thunder Bay or Sault Ste Marie, I am talking about Sioux Lookout, Kenora or Dryden, to use three examples from northwestern Ontario. These are communities with small populations, communities whose operations are seasonal.

In the past, there have been air services in these communities. By and large, these air services were established by entrepreneurs. Someone in the private sector sees a potential for the development of an air route and works extremely hard to develop that route and to get people to use air services rather than the roads and the rails.

Yes, these entrepreneurs had monopolies, but those monopolies were regulated and controlled by the Parliament of Canada through its agencies. As well, there was a need for those monopolies. Such a monopoly would ensure that a carrier who had invested time, energy and, most important, money to establish that route had some protection. Protection