

Aeronautics Act

construction or operation. Surely that is an inadequate provision. Compensation should be available to those who can justify injury, not only those affected by land required for airport development.

I hope the government will accept this amendment. They know as well as we do that the overwhelming majority of motions would not pass this parliament even though 20 members would sign. In fact, a motion would not pass even if 50 members would sign it. It would be debated for a day or so. Unless there was some kind of severe injury being caused by the government which resulted in a revolt among backbenchers, 90 per cent of the motions would not pass. But the fact that it is there would at least indicate a desire and a willingness by the government to be a lot more conscious of what they put in regulations, when, how and where they consult about regulations, and how, when and where they enforce those regulations.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired. He may continue only with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Benjamin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had almost run out of gas anyway.

Mr. Alexander: Gas? Never use that word.

Mr. Nielsen: That's a bad word.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Like user-pay.

Mr. Benjamin: I am glad I have extra time because most of my colleagues agree with what I have to say. I have not really stepped on anyone's toes except those of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and others in my caucus by suggesting this kind of amendment would be useful in all types of legislation. This is something all members should think about. It is certainly not a partisan amendment because every political party takes its turn some time or other being in opposition or in government. Over the long haul, it really does no harm to a government, but it certainly is good for the work of parliament.

Most important, it gives the citizens of this country the feeling that there is an avenue of appeal through their elected representatives. It is a method other than having a cabinet hit your town two or three weeks before an election is called. It is an avenue by which citizens can voice their opinion and concerns to their elected members of parliament. There would be second thought, consideration or debate not only about the laws we pass, but about regulations a government may bring in as a result of those laws. Surely that is an improvement over what we have been doing for many years.

There is now provision in two or three pieces of legislation for this type of motion to be put, signed by ten, 20 or 50 members of parliament. It has been tried on a few occasions in the past few years. I do not think any have been passed by the

majority of members of the House. However, it did provide an avenue for members on all sides to express their view concerning some activity by government as a result of a law passed by this parliament or regulations emanating from a law passed by this parliament. There was that opportunity for members on all sides to discuss it for a day or so.

This kind of amendment has been moved on many occasions by members of all three opposition parties. I am not certain, but I believe that when the government party was in opposition in the late fifties and early sixties they endeavoured to get this type of amendment, or something similar to it, incorporated into legislation. Therefore, it is not peculiar to any one particular party. It is a valuable mechanism in the legislative process. It is particularly valuable as an avenue to appeal or reconsider a decision made, or action taken, by the government or the administration of that government.

I hope members on all sides will accept this amendment as an excellent addition to this bill. We take pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to intervene in the debate on this amendment to Bill C-4. I did not have the opportunity to participate in all the committee meetings I would have liked to with regard to this bill.

At the outset, I commend the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) on the work he has done both in the House and in committee. He is a true friend of general aviation. As a private pilot, I know some of what he has done for aviation. As I say, I regret I was not able to attend all of those meetings.

With regard to this bill, the hon. member for Vegreville has been able to convince the government to drop clauses 7 and 8 which would have resulted in two classes of both passengers and carriers. He was instrumental in eliminating the necessity of bonding all aircraft up to 12,500 pounds. The hon. member worked hard to get changes in the regulations having to do with the licencing of small airfields which is so important to flying farmers and others who operate small airfields, as I once did.

● (2122)

As to the necessity for this amendment, it is necessary for someone to get the various orders put out by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) because the Department of Transport is invariably cast in the role of an adversary. A person might think he was in court. Whatever it is, whether it is a medical update, the licensing of pilots, the licensing of fields or other facilities, there are regulations dealing with every aspect of general aviation and the department is always an adversary, never a supporter. I know from my own experience and from the mail I get that the department inevitably takes an adversary position.

There was a time when we had one or two friends in the department, people we could count on. Now I do not think we have any. There used to be one or two people who were well known to general aviation and who could be counted on. If