

Air Canada

certainly be made by the Government and the new board of directors in an effort to convince the corporation to check on the profitability of these routes. I feel that service by Air Canada will definitely stop in some regions. We did face a similar problem with a number of railway lines which had to be abandoned because they were no longer profitable. I should not like the same thing to happen following the privatization of Air Canada.

Madam Speaker, thousands of jobs are at stake. A private board of directors will not feel responsible for serving frontier regions or for regional development. Privatization will inevitably result in a major drop with level of service to our regional communities.

Has Air Canada really lost its public purpose to justify its privatization, or is it just another one of this government's mischievous projects? The Government's only motive is profit. The Canadian people must be consulted on all these issues. The Tory Government is not concerned with providing the Canadian public with a fair and equitable air service from coast to coast.

• (1600)

Mr. Grisé: Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to my colleague from (Saint-Maurice) and although a newcomer in this House, or relatively so, since he has been here for nearly two years, unfortunately it hasn't taken him long—even if he does not run again—to acquire the same bad habit as his Liberal colleagues, of alarming Canadians with false information and unjustified fears. Where does the Hon. Member from Saint-Maurice get the notion that, by being partially privatized, Air Canada will abandon its lines? Where does he get the notion that 7,000 or 8,000 jobs will be lost?

Where does he get the notion that, if Air Canada is privatized, it will lose its identity and will no longer be identified as a Canadian airline? How can he say that the existing legislation guarantees that the operational and overhaul centres will be maintained in Dorval, Toronto and Winnipeg? Where is it written? Why does the Hon. Member resort to these fear-monger tactics when he states that the head office, even if it stays in Montréal, will lose its decision-making power? Has he no confidence in the ability of Air Canada's management? Is that what he is telling us? When he speaks of privatization and of its awful consequences, does he remember what happened with de Havilland? I want him to tell me how many jobs have been lost at de Havilland? How many jobs have been lost at Canadair since its takeover by Bombardier? Is he questioning the management of that company by Bombardier since it stopped to be a Crown Corporation? Is that what the Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice is telling us?

Madam Speaker, does it mean that Telelobe Canada no longer belongs to the Canadian public and no longer serves it? That is, Madam Speaker, the type of falsehood that have to be exposed. The Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice is making those false statements without reason. On what basis can he

maintain that the actual legislation protects the employees? On the contrary, it is the new Bill that confirms, that guarantees that there will be headquarters in Montreal, and maintenance centres in Winnipeg, Toronto and Dorval. That is respected. It is clearly indicated in the Bill.

For once I would like to hear . . . I am disappointed, Madam Speaker, with the remarks of the Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice who is not used to speak so many untruths. I am sure he did not write that speech.

• (1610)

Mr. Grondin: For your information, my dear colleague, I should like to say that I feel that we are sitting in this House to protect Canadians, rather like you are trying to do, but not in the way you intend to do it. Then, it is not a matter of saying that a text is relevant or not . . . I think that I respect you as much for your comments which were perhaps whispered to you by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) than for those which you could eventually make on the basis of my remarks which . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order. I would appreciate it greatly if the Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice (Mr. Grondin) directed his comments to the Chair rather than to his colleague.

Mr. Grondin: Madam Speaker, it is probably due, as my colleague said earlier, to my lack of . . . I have been sitting in this House for only two years. It may be the reason, the lack of experience.

However, Madam Speaker, I should like merely to repeat what I said earlier. I will repeat the fact that to maximize profits a private company must definitely make some changes and I think that all privatized companies have always tried in the past to reap maximum profits. Unfortunately, such is the concern of Air Canada. I think that it is important for all Canadians to be aware of the problems due to privatization which even if it is not complete at present opens the door to complete privatization. I think that we are not being partisan when we mention in this House how important it is for Canadians to follow closely the debate on the privatization of Air Canada to avoid a brutal awakening following the privatization of that company.

Mr. Keeper: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member. He suggested deregulation and privatization would lead to reduced service. That was his conclusion. I would like to know if he is aware the Liberal Government started deregulation. That was the first step along the road to privatization, the first step along the road to service reduction. Is the Hon. Member now ready to recommend to his own party that they admit they made the first step along the road to service reduction?

Mr. Grondin: Madam Speaker, I would simply like to assure the Hon. Member that we wanted to retain a degree of control, and at that time there was a will in Government to proceed,