

S.O. 21

refused all passengers of Air Canada who purchased bargain weekend flight tickets to take advantage of the discount fare and travel to their destinations. The U.S. Government has linked this issue to the negotiations involving Continental Airlines of Los Angeles to enable it to compete with C.P. Air of Vancouver and Qantas of Australia for passenger business between Canada and Australia. As well, the American Government is seeking total deregulation of cross border air travel.

These cases are totally unrelated to air discount fares, and therefore it is difficult to understand why the U.S. would reject one hundred thousand Canadian tourists. Must innocent individuals suffer because "Life With Uncle" continues to be fraught with difficulties?

CONDEMNATION OF UNITED STATES POSITION ON FLIGHTS TO ORIENT

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Madam Speaker, I would like to make a statement concerning the same issue.

The travel plans of thousands of Canadians are in limbo because the United States has cancelled Air Canada's seat sale air fares on a pretext involving totally separate issues of air fares to Australia and other parts of the Pacific. The United States Government is taking Canadian tourists hostage to try to win a point it was unable to win in negotiations for a new agreement between Canada and the United States.

The United States Government wants us to violate our air agreement with Australia in order to let Continental Airlines, a company which does not even fly to Canada, to siphon Canadian air passengers through Los Angeles. We do not tell the United States to violate its agreements with other countries. We must not let the United States meddle in our relations with other countries. If our country gives in to demands of the United States, the survival of Canadian airlines would be threatened. If we let the United States siphon off Canadian traffic to the Orient, it would only be a matter of time before American airlines would siphon off Canadian traffic to Europe. Eventually, transcontinental traffic between Canadian cities would be routed through large U.S. Airports.

The question is whether Canada wants to have a national airline system. Are we to be an independent and sovereign nation north of the 49th parallel, or are we to be just an appendage of the United States' transportation system and economy? We call upon the Government of Canada to send a strongly worded protest to the United States administration to let it know that, if it persists in this additional attack on friendly relations, there are reciprocal actions which Canada can take—

Madam Speaker: Order.

MACDONALD COMMISSION

OBJECTION TO CHAIRMAN'S REMUNERATION

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Madam Speaker, I want to read a letter sent to me by the Regional Municipality of Niagara. It states:

The following resolution of the Regional Finance Committee, approved and adopted by the Council of the Regional Municipality of Niagara February 17, 1983, is referred to you, as directed, for appropriate action:

'That the Council of the Regional Municipality of Niagara objects to the \$800 per day payment being made to the Chairman of the commission examining the Canadian economy, recently appointed by the federal Government, on the grounds that the payment is considered exorbitant and not in the spirit of restraint presently being suggested by all levels of Government.

That this objection be lodged with all federal Members of Parliament who attend the Tri-Level Government meetings in Niagara.'

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

THE ECONOMY

PREMIERS' SUGGESTION OF FIRST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister, in the absence of the Prime Minister, and relates to the response of Premier Buchanan to the invitation of the Prime Minister with respect to discussion of the economy of the country. Speaking on behalf of the Premiers, he suggested a full-scale summit between the federal Government and the provincial Premiers on the disastrous state of the Canadian economy.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister inform the House whether the Prime Minister is giving favourable consideration to this proposal of the Premiers, rather than the Prime Minister's suggestion that the economy be discussed somewhere between the entrée and dessert at 24 Sussex?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister has received the message from Premier Buchanan—

Mr. Epp: Good. What's he doing with it?

Mr. MacEachen:—and is about to send a reply to the Premier indicating that it would not be feasible, because of other arrangements which have been made with respect to the constitutional conference, to have the type of meeting that Premier Buchanan has suggested at that particular time, but that it will be possible for the Premiers to meet with the Prime Minister on the evening after the constitutional conference and, if necessary, as has already been indicated, to meet again the following morning, at which time they would be able to consider the medium term objectives of all the Governments