

Air Canada

around the world. In other words, he was talking about getting rid of the Wheat Board as the sole grain marketing agency in this country and turning it over to private enterprise like Cargill. This is an example of Conservatives talking out of both sides of their mouths, depending on who their particular audience is.

We have the Air Canada bill before us, and the Conservatives want profit to be a major and main priority for Air Canada. If that is done, it will ruin one of the basic principles of transportation in this country, which is to provide a service to every Canadian regardless of where that Canadian lives, at the lowest possible cost. If that is done, a lot stronger country will be developed than we have today. Also there will be a lot more equity and fairness in the country than we have today, and there will be a lot more dispersed development.

If the country is set up on the profit motive, there will be a tremendous amount of centralization.

Mr. Hurlburt: What about Manitoba and British Columbia?

● (2142)

Mr. Nystrom: If you have subsidized transportation, then there will be more incentive for people to establish industries in this country in places other than Montreal, Vancouver, and Toronto. There will be more incentive for people to live in places other than the four or five big cities in the country if they can have good transportation facilities. I know what I am speaking about because I come from a constituency which has fought for years for a good air service. I believe the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) has already referred to places like Dauphin, Yorkton, and Brandon. But if you operate a transportation system only on profit, we will never get transportation by air for these centres because they are too small and it is not profitable. The official critic of the Conservative party, the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), says that is right. He is right, but if the priority of Air Canada is to operate solely on profit, you will not have a service for those communities.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nystrom: When the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) was speaking and the Conservatives started to heckle, somebody said he flushed them out. I think the time has come for me to flush them down.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: That is what happened in Manitoba to you.

Mr. Nystrom: That is what happens in a society where huge corporations are given as much leeway as possible to make a profit. That is their guiding light, Mr. Speaker. Their guiding light is the almighty buck, profit, regardless of whom it might harm. This is the same Conservative party which, a few days or a few weeks ago, was talking about the great things that the government has done in defence of INCO, the great tax

[Mr. Nystrom.]

write-offs to create some incentives in our society. I am surprised they are not saying "hear, hear!". They want more of those incentives. But what happens when we have a corporation which gets those handouts, laying off workers in places such as Sudbury and Thompson? That is the type of philosophy that the Conservatives and the Liberals have.

As the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) said, both parties are the same. There are as many small "l" liberals in one party as in the other, and as many small "c" conservatives in one party as in the other. He ought to know, he has been in both of them, he has been inside the hides of both of them. He said that both of them had the same philosophy and the same ideology, and the only differences are in the personalities in the two parties. If it comes down to just personalities, there is no real difference if anyone wants to make any real changes.

I argue very strongly that the motion put before the House by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre be supported, that we strike out of the bill in particular the contemplation of profit because, if it remains, Air Canada will have it as one of its primary objectives and this will be very destructive and negative for the air transportation facilities in our country.

Mr. Murta: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order just to clarify the total misinterpretation by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) of what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) said in my constituency this summer. The reason I waited until now is that I wanted to allow the hon. member to finish his remarks. I did not want to interrupt him. The reference was made in connection with the Canadian Wheat Board. The hon. member is totally wrong.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member cannot use the procedure of raising a point of order to clarify a statement that was made outside the House. If it were a statement he had made himself, he could use the rules of the House to make a clarification, but to give an explanation of something that did not occur in this place can be done only if the hon. member sought the floor and participated in the debate.

Mr. Murta: Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken in this debate. What I meant to do was to clarify an erroneous statement made by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville which I do not believe should go unchallenged in the House of Commons. It was in connection with what the Leader of the Opposition said in relation to the Canadian Wheat Board. The Leader of the Opposition is completely and totally behind the Canadian Wheat Board, as is the Conservative party.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): How far behind?

Mr. Murta: And we feel the Board has done a good job. We are looking at ways to improve their selling function. That is what the Leader of the Opposition said, and the hon. member left a totally false impression in the House of Commons.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The remarks of the hon. member prove that he was raising a point of debate, not a point of order.