

Supply

Air Canada Act, he would know that, I believe Clause 2, or Clause 3 says specifically that Air Canada has to worry about profit and must conduct itself as if it were a company involved in business.

Mr. Crosby: How come it lost \$65 million?

Mr. Mazankowski: I moved the amendment.

Mr. Deniger: It was the amendment of the Tory Party, which was logical. The third point I want to raise with the Hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, is that if I was from Halifax and I am from Montreal—I would not want decisions involving the aircraft I use, the fares I pay, and the service I receive, to be imposed by a regulatory agency in Ottawa or in Hull. I would like the people in my province to have some say in the matter. That is precisely what we are offering and precisely what our domestic air policy is saying. We are saying that the consumer, the user, will have more say in the policy. I trust the consumers a lot more than I trust people who do not live in the area, in my region, making decisions for me. I am especially surprised at the Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby). We sat together on the regulatory reform committee where we unanimously presented a paper which dealt with reforms of regulations. He seems to have forgotten that report.

Mr. Crosby: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not forgotten the report. However, I believe there is a great deal of confusion present in the House in relation to the remarks made by my colleague. We are talking, I believe, about different kinds of deregulation. The Hon. Member, as I understand his last intervention, is talking about the domestic air carrier policy approved by the Standing Committee on Transport. I would like to ask the Hon. Member very simply, does the Minister of Transport endorse that report? Is he prepared to put it into operation? Because on the advice of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vegreville, and on the advice of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley-Hants, I would endorse that, plain and simply. That is the way to do it. But from the information I have, and I do not have the time or opportunity to go through it in detail, that is not the kind of deregulation the Minister of Transport is talking about.

We had a meeting which was graced by the presence of the Hon. Member for Vegreville the other day in which we discussed statements made by the Minister of Transport on deregulation. They bear no relationship to this report. He has never endorsed this report. He has never said he is prepared to implement, as part of deregulation or other policy, the recommendations of this report. He has just got a quick fix attitude, take the controls off air fares and the first airline approaching bankruptcy will knock down its air fares in order to buoy itself up, get some cash flow going, then the next outfit will start to go bankrupt. That is what happened in the States.

Braniff Airlines was one of the most effective airlines in the United States. The airlines got into a price war and now it is out of business. Braniff is gone today. That is what will happen. EPA will go, then Quebecair will go, under the

proposals of the Minister of Transport. And most importantly, jobs will go. That is what I am saying.

Yes, I am in favour of deregulation. The Hon. Member knows that because, as he said, we sat together on the regulatory reform committee. It is important for the Canadian economy. However, it is more important to proceed in an orderly fashion in determining just what are the elements in the regulation policy which can be changed effectively, and changing those elements. We should not simply take the controls off the ticket prices and let the market prevail, because what we will end up is a lot of people flying back and forth for a few months and then a lot of bankrupt airlines. We already know what happened in the United States and we do not want that to happen in Canada.

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Speaker, I have one question for the Hon. Member. It concerns shipbuilding in Canada. It is one of my favourite subjects and I understand it is also one of his. It just so happens, Sir, that I was having supper with a ship owner last night. He was having a ship building offshore. The price of this vessel will be some \$8 million. Being a good patriotic Canadian he wanted to have this vessel built in Canada. But I believe the cheapest price he could get in Canada was nearly double, some \$15 million.

From my conversation with him it appeared that one of the reasons he could get the ship built a lot cheaper offshore was that foreign governments extend credit at low rates and perhaps even subsidize their own shipyards. It seems to me that if the price is doubled in Canada, you are not going to sell very many ships out of Canadian shipyards to Canadians. I wonder if the Hon. Member has any solutions to this very difficult problem faced by our shipyards?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order, please. Unfortunately, this puts an end to the ten-minute question period and we are resuming debate at this point.

Mr. Crosby: I do not have an opportunity to respond?

Mr. Nickerson: On unanimous consent?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to complete his answer?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

An Hon. Member: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): I heard no. Debate.

• (1540)

[Translation]

Mr. Rémi Bujold (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, today I find it very difficult to understand why the Opposition moved this motion. After listening to my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House this morning and after reading several times over the motion that was moved, which mentions contradictory statements which have created