

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Mr. Fairweather: I understand the hon. member cannot give an answer to my question at this time.

Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary had no reason to apologize for the absence of the minister. Indeed I am glad that he had the courage to proceed with second reading of this legislation, for I believe that ministers should entrust the presentation of legislation more frequently to the second string, the men and the hon. lady in the third row who are coming along. I am glad that by reason of the minister's absence the hon. gentleman had this opportunity tonight.

This bill represents a significant chance in our immigration procedure and administration. Quite probably it is overdue.

I remember very well when years ago the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill) now Minister of Transport, said that there was probably more paper work in the then Department of Citizenship and Immigration than in any other department of government. He spoke from knowledge gained as Clerk of the Privy Council and as cabinet minister, and I think that what he said is probably still true today. This legislation may well prove to be a relief to successive ministers of manpower and immigration.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock? I will continue my remarks when this bill is next before the house.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the house leader what will be our business for tomorrow?

Mr. McIlraith: Tomorrow we propose to submit for the consideration of the house the following items on today's order paper: Items 83, 100, 116, 126, 127, 132, 130 and 131.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that perhaps the house leader is a little presumptuous.

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker, just optimistic.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

[Mr. Munro.]

AIR CANADA—SUGGESTED INCREASED USE OF WINNIPEG MAINTENANCE BASE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 13, as recorded in *Hansard* at page 12946, I put this question to the Minister of Transport:

In view of reports that the Air Canada base at Dorval is not now adequate for its maintenance and overhaul work and that its facilities will have to be expanded, could the minister remind Air Canada of the fact that its base at Winnipeg could handle both the Viscounts and the DC-9 aircraft?

The reply of the Minister of Transport was one short sentence, not particularly helpful. It was as follows:

I have no doubt Air Canada will take note of the hon. gentleman's representations.

In view of that answer, I am sure the minister was not surprised when I posted this question for a few remarks on one of these late shows. It would be a gross understatement merely to say that the people of Winnipeg have been disappointed over the various steps that have been taken which have reduced the use of Air Canada's maintenance and overhaul facilities at Winnipeg. These steps have been taken over a number of years, despite the many delegations to Ottawa during two or three different governmental régimes and despite very thorough examination of the whole situation. I recognize, as do most of us in Winnipeg, that whether we like it or not the die has been pretty well cast and that for the most part Air Canada's maintenance and overhaul operations are destined to be performed at Dorval.

However, it has come as a bitter piece of news to workers at Winnipeg to learn that Air Canada is now planning an elaborate extension of its facilities at Dorval. It appears that this expansion is necessary in order to cope with the amount of work that is piling up. The reason that this pill is a bit bitter to the people of Winnipeg is that the Thompson report, which was the last full scale inquiry into this matter, based its approval of the removal of the maintenance and overhaul work from Winnipeg to Montreal on a number of considerations, one of which was that the facilities already established at Montreal were greatly under-utilized.

I have a copy of Mr. Thompson's report here, and I have been noting in particular references on pages 86, 96 and 106, in which Mr. Thompson sets out the various arguments. The commissioner stated, in effect, that in view of the fact the various facilities are under-utilized at Montreal, it would be a