

*Government Orders*

What about national symbols? Quite frankly, I believe Canadians do give a damn, when they get into an airplane, what the symbol is on the tail of the airplane. I believe that they would rather see the maple leaf on the tail of many aircraft, rather than the red stars and stripes of the United States, as great as they are and as big as they are in travel, and God bless them all.

• (1600)

Why should we not have some sense of national pride in who moves us across this beautiful, vast country called Canada? There have been a lot of industry analysts who have suggested that unless we provide the safeguards, and the minister is very keen on quoting Air Canada and Canadian as being supporting of the open skies concept, but every quote by every spokesperson for both Air Canada and Canadian that I have read has always said that they require negotiated safeguards as a bare minimum.

That is not open skies. That is not on a level playing field. That is a re-regulation of the current agreement, a modification upon conditions, and not a deregulation of the 1974 agreement completely. Industry observers say that Canada's two major airlines may not survive in the face of the United States competition, or at least not in their current form.

Steve Garmaise in the *Financial Post*, which this government loves to quote day in and day out, an analyst for First Marathon Securities Ltd., has predicted that Air Canada and Canadian Airlines may have to merge international routes within five years if U.S. carriers compete head to head with Canadian air carriers.

Tony Hine, an analyst for ScotiaMcLeod Inc. said that two airlines might have to become feeder services to larger U.S. air carriers. That is on another front called the open skies.

We also have a move to once again privatize user fees on the altar of cost recovery on the basis that the government does not have the necessary capital or perhaps does not attach the necessary priority on having the necessary capital with respect to cost recovery programs.

In the shipping industry the government may in fact, upon consultations that will be completed on February 1, try to raise \$25 million through imposing new fees that have never been imposed before on shipping companies which use the services of our national Coast Guard.

Does this government recognize that our shipping industry is one of the greatest success stories in the Canadian transport industry, so much so that the Americans were not willing to compete with us in the shipping industry, and is on a troubled course as it is right now, that shipping has gone down 10 per cent, that jobs have been lost in the shipping industry as well and that any increase in additional fees will only serve to destabilize shipping industries?

When we speak of the interests of Quebec, the Port of Montreal and the Port of Quebec City and the large shipping infrastructure in that province, we are going to impose on the province of Quebec—and I see some colleagues from that province on the opposite side—over half of the \$25 million to be raised from the province of Quebec's shipping industry, namely \$14 million out of the \$25 million in terms of increased costs. Does the Quebec shipping industry want that? Is that going to make it more competitive along the seaway in terms of competing internationally? I think not.

What about the cost recovery program in terms of landing rights at our airports across Canada? My colleague from the province of New Brunswick stood in his place today. My colleague from northern Canada, the hon. member for Western Arctic, stood last week. People in our caucus in western Canada suggested that the cost recovery basis in terms of landing fees is simply unfair, inequitable and unworkable. Up to now the landing fees have taken into account that smaller aircraft travel shorter distances, carry fewer passengers and charge less in terms of ticket fares and therefore generate less revenue. Therefore, the landing fees for smaller aircraft take into account those variables.

Now the government is contemplating abandoning those variables and suggesting that the landing fees should be based on only a proportional weight of the incoming aircraft. What will that mean? It will mean two things. First, smaller aircraft will pay proportionately greater amounts to land in the airports than larger aircraft. Second, the regional airports in the regional