

*Transportation*

Minister of Transport were to compete with someone, he would smarten up.

**Mr. Churchill:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Kindt:** Let me talk about air lines and competition, and in particular about Air Canada, with no competition. During the strike, when Canadian Pacific Airlines was stopping at Calgary, you could board Air Canada at Calgary and go to Winnipeg, and to Toronto, at almost any time. Air Canada was putting extra flights on at Calgary. They were special flights. I came down today on a special flight. I actually came down from Calgary to Toronto. But when it came to getting from Toronto to Ottawa, I had to stand in line. Seventeen others could not get on the aircraft, because there were no seats. There was no competition from Canadian Pacific Airlines, or from any other line, on the run from Toronto to Ottawa. Where Air Canada does not have competition, it could well do with some.

● (9:50 p.m.)

We should take a hard look at this competitive aspect. I have always been a supporter of Air Canada and I still am, but the time is coming when we shall have to consider introducing a little competition. I think competition is the lifeblood of industry and I hope the Minister of Industry will agree with me. I am sure he will. Unless there is competition, no company will put its best foot forward. If there is, they will look at the pattern for which they are trying to provide a service and place their facilities at the points where they must meet competition and where it is evident that competition is a factor. I do not know how long we can continue without admitting the necessity for competition if we are to maintain freedom of enterprise.

I had hoped the minister would permit this bill to go to committee even before second reading, so that representatives of agriculture and industry from all over Canada could make recommendations and suggestions. Once this bill has been given second reading, how many changes will the minister be willing to make? I am sure he will find all the arguments under the sun for not changing it. He will bring these people to Ottawa from western Canada, and then he will say to them: Yes, you have a good idea, but the bill has been given second reading by parliament and we cannot change it now.

Legislation of this kind will not go down at all. I hope when the bill does go to commit-

[Mr. Kindt.]

tee, people from all parts of Canada who are affected by it will be in a position to make suggestions for changes and that those suggestions, if they are good ones, will be incorporated in the legislation when it is finally passed.

It may be that the whole process should be started again, from the beginning. The minister has had certain ideas about railroad abandonment, and so on, which are expressed in this bill. I am not too sure he is on the right track. We will have to consider that aspect. I feel strongly that the arrangements proposed are not likely to be in the public interest or, indeed, in the interest of anybody. They will satisfy no one. I feel, therefore, we are bound to take a hard look at it before this legislation is enacted into law.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** It appears there are a number of other hon. members who wish to speak. I wonder, therefore, if I might make the usual motion in order to give hon. members additional time in which to express their views on this bill.

**Mr. Churchill:** You would not give a supper adjournment hour so do not try to squeeze us now.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I could, of course make the usual motion and let ten hon. members stand up, but I do not wish to embarrass hon. members opposite.

**Mr. Graffey:** We do not embarrass easily.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I should like to say that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) in the most co-operative way suggested we should get over this general debate and let the measure go before a committee, where all these questions could be answered. I hope this is still the spirit of the party opposite and that nothing has happened to change it.

**Mr. Churchill:** Instant legislation.

**Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West):** I have a few brief remarks I should like to make on the second reading of this bill. They have to do with the terms upon which railways are abandoned, what should happen to the right-of-way, and how these abandonments ought to be dealt with when they take place.

I had a bill on the order paper in 1962, and again in 1963, dealing with this subject. I hope that now, when the Railway Act is to be overhauled, the government will see fit to