

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, if Questions Nos. 281 and 288 could be made Orders for Return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House that Questions Nos. 281 and 288 be deemed to have been made Orders for Return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

GOVERNMENT SPENDING IN CONSTITUENCY OF CROWFOOT
Question No. 281—**Mr. Malone:**

Since September, 1984, have any government departments or agencies spent money or provided grants in the constituency of Crowfoot, and if so, in each case (a) by which department or agency (b) in what amounts (c) under which categories and programs was the money spent?

Return tabled.

DREDGING OPERATIONS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Question No. 288—**Mr. Riis:**

1. In the last four fiscal years, has the Government contributed moneys to any dredging operations in (a) British Columbia (b) the constituency of Kamloops—Shuswap and, if so, what was the amount contributed in each year?

2. Since September 4, 1984, has any government department or agency contributed money to projects in the constituency of Kamloops—Shuswap and, if so, to what projects and, in each case (a) by what department or agency (b) in what amounts?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Hawkes: Madam Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, the Government is willing to respond to Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. P-9 in the name of the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton). I do not see the Member in the House and I do not know if he has yet named an agent. I do not see any sign that he has. Therefore, I would ask that all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Shall all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers stand?

Air Canada

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

AIR CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Tuesday, May 24, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mr. George Minaker (Winnipeg—St. James): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Bill C-129 in the House today because Air Canada is a major employer in my riding of Winnipeg—St. James. The international airport and terminal buildings are located within the riding. As well the overhaul maintenance base in Winnipeg is located in my riding, so many of my constituents are very interested in what happens and develops with Air Canada.

I have spoken with captains, first officers, flight attendants, ground crews, baggage handlers and so on from Air Canada. A total of some 2,100 people are employed by Air Canada in Winnipeg, the majority of whom are constituents of mine. As you realize, Madam Speaker, there is very keen interest on the part of residents in my riding in how this Bill develops and proceeds through the House of Commons.

• (1520)

I think it would be proper for me to give the House some background into the history of Air Canada in Winnipeg—St. James. Since the airline's inception in 1937, it has been located at the airport in St. James, and at that time, the airline was known as Trans-Canada Air Lines. Then, in 1966 to 1969, the then Liberal Government decided to move the Winnipeg overhaul base from Winnipeg. In December of 1968, Prime Minister Trudeau's office would not interfere with the decision of Air Canada to move the base, so the move proceeded to take place.

At that time, the lives of many of my friends and their families and relatives were disrupted for several years because of that decision. The people of Winnipeg have never forgotten that decision. There were families with the husband living in Montreal and the rest of the family living in Winnipeg, not seeing each other for weeks at a time or even for months on end. It disrupted many families.

Then, in 1975 or 1976, the Government decided, I believe under pressure from representatives of the Opposition of the time, the Progressive Conservatives from the Winnipeg area, to reinstate the overhaul base in the Winnipeg region. There is