

[Translation]

**AIR SAFETY**

## TREATMENT OF NON-SMOKING AIR TRAVELLERS

**M. Henri Tousignant (Témiscamingue):** Madam Speaker, some time ago, I rose in this House to speak publicly about what I consider the ridiculous and unacceptable treatment given to non-smoking air travellers.

I then said that smoke must be more intelligent than man as it must inevitably obey non-smoking signs.

Any air traveller knows how easy it is to throw a cigarette butt inadvertently in the washroom trash can. In fact, this possibility has not yet been totally ruled out in the investigation of last Thursday's tragedy in Cincinnati.

In view of this, it is perhaps time to look straight in the eye those who persist in claiming the right to indulge in their little whims, not to say the right to endanger the life of their fellow travellers.

What is the Canadian Transport Commission waiting for to ban this cannibalistic practice outright or at least to charge \$20 extra to those who think nothing of endangering the life of others?

**An Hon. Member:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

[English]

**ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY**

## INTRODUCTION OF FLAT RATE LOCKAGE FEES

**Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines):** Madam Speaker, the shipping industry is in its worst crisis since World War II. What has been one of the most successful transportation industries in Canada, and one of the few industries in which Canadians have been internationally competitive, is now in serious trouble. To make matters even worse, the St. Lawrence Seaway has introduced a flat rate lockage charge, introduced to discourage the use of existing smaller ships on the Seaway. However, neither market conditions nor Government support warrant the carriers getting into a new larger ship construction program. Furthermore, few of the 40 or more community ports around the Great Lakes can handle ships the size contemplated by the Seaway.

As a result, there are fewer transits on the Seaway, resulting in a higher deficit to that agency than need be, and because of this shortsighted policy, port communities are threatened with job lay-offs and plant closures. Studies show the need for both small and intermediate sized ships to ensure the efficient transportation of bulk cargoes. Why, at a time when the sluggish economy of the nation has eliminated the reason for imposing flat rate lockage fees, does the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) not reverse this decision of high tolls and lockage fees, or does he really want to bring the industry to its knees?

S.O. 21

**HOUSE OF COMMONS**

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE URGED FOR POLITICAL PARTY LEADERSHIP CANDIDATES

**Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, during a leadership convention of any of the federal political parties, a number of the candidates who are Members of Parliament completely withdraw their services from the House of Commons for as long as four months in order to run for the leadership, or else to lobby on behalf of one of the candidates.

In that period their campaign is one of directing their skills and their drive for personal gain and personal promotion. They do not generally participate in the day to day business of the House, nor do they debate the many important issues that must be settled for the good management of the country. Their attention to constituency business is also curtailed. Yet in this interval they draw full pay and allowances as parliamentarians.

I feel that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections should consider looking into the possibility of having MPs who are leadership candidates for the various Parties declared to be on leave of absence for the period of their campaigning, and study whether they should be paid on a per diem rate for the occasional days on which they appear in the House or undertake their constituency duties.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**

## CONDEMNATION OF COST AND POLICY

**Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Madam Speaker, according to a paper presented to a Learned Societies Conference at the University of British Columbia this week, the Government pays twice as much for the preparation of a public advertisement as does a private advertiser. The paper goes on to observe that this over-payment may in effect be compensation for cheap or even free services rendered to the Liberal Party at election time.

It has long been obvious that the vast majority of Government advertising served no public function other than to emphasize the benevolence of the Government and the governing Party and its omnipresence in our daily lives. It has been a burr under the saddles of all of us who have been concerned about Government waste and needless expense. Now the reason for it, and for the Government's refusal to cut back on it, is revealed. It is a reason that is repugnant to the vast majority of Canadians, to people who believe that morality in Government remains a valid requirement, one that is not overridden by the immediate interests of the Liberal Party. As has happened so frequently in the last three years, the Government stands condemned by its own actions, in the eyes of all of Canada.