

Government Orders

What I wanted to refer my hon. friend to is the bogey man of deregulation, and what it does for remote communities. I do not have the Thunder Bay figures but let us use another northern community.

Before deregulation, Sudbury had 17 flights a week. After deregulation, Sudbury has 105 flights a week. This is to Toronto.

The hon. member for Sudbury is here. I ask the hon. member, does she suggest that the people of Sudbury would like to go back to 17 flights a week? The hon. member is nodding her head, therefore I assume she is suggesting that the community of Sudbury would like to cut down all these darn flights that mean you can go any time of the day or night. Let us get rid of all that choice. Let us go back to 17 flights a week. That is just a little over two a day. Why have all that choice?

Talk to the business people in Sudbury. Talk to the business people flying to Sudbury. My hon. friend knows there has been a big increase in the economic outlook of Sudbury under the Progressive Conservative government. These 105 flights a week are part of the reason for that success.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I found the minister's comments interesting because I am sure that Sudbury would really like to have jet service back. I am sure it would like to have the prices that it used to pay back. I do not know what the prices are there, but I can tell you that it now costs upwards of \$700 to fly from Thunder Bay to Ottawa. Pre-deregulation it was \$300.

There is still jet service part of the time Thunder Bay to Winnipeg. Other times, Mr. Speaker, you are down to as little as 12-seaters. The community of Dryden has lost its jet service. It has also lost its role as a hub for that part of northwestern Ontario. It has also lost a lot of economic clout because having jet service into that community was an impetus for them and assisted in its development.

When the minister says that deregulation is great, I can give him chapter and verse as to why it really has not met the theories that were espoused by his predecessor and are currently espoused by himself.

Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the minister is in the House. I am sure that my colleague from Sudbury who is standing behind me would certainly like to respond to those

comments he made. Obviously that will have to wait for another day. I can assure you that those comments will be made.

While the minister is with us, I would like to publicly thank him on behalf of the people of Thunder Bay for his announcement on his last visit that he will be replacing the present air passenger terminal in that community with a much larger and a much needed new facility. Further to his commitment that this facility will be in place in time to meet the increased demands that all people of northwestern Ontario anticipate with the great influx of tourists that will come as a result of the Nordic Games, I thank the minister very much for seeing the wisdom of that need and obliging the people of the community with that very important transportation mode.

• (1730)

In 1987, the government introduced its policy of transferring the management of Transport Canada airports to incorporated business entities called local airport authorities. I am a bit disturbed, in listening to the debate the other day and as it progresses today, with the confusion seems to lie in what we are really talking about when discussing local airport authorities. That confusion seems to be between what is called the privatization of airports in Canada and the administering the local airport authorities under local airport groups.

I will take just a moment to explain my concept. With Terminal 3, which will be opened in the first part of February with the opening of the new airport, all privatization means is that a group of people have come in and invested \$400 million to \$500 million and built Terminal 3. They will be able to operate that entity on its own with the rental of space and the recovery of its \$400 million to \$500 million worth of expenditure over a period of years.

There is some confusion in the marketplace inasmuch as Terminal 3 certainly will be the result and will be paid back by the eventual payer in all business entities and that is the consumer. I have toured Terminal 3 and it is a beautiful looking airport. Given what we have been told that Terminal 3's rental structure is about four, five or six times that of the highest rental structure in Toronto now, which is the Eaton Centre, I wonder whether or not the consumer, that is the Canadian traveller, will be able to afford to use this facility.