

avoidance of parliament do not give representative government. It just means that every four years or so there will be a new government to make decisions irrespective of the wishes of the people.

I submit that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vegreville is a reasoned request that the government examine the Aeronautics Act again. He is offering the government a chance to allow people who might in some way be affronted by the regulations to bring their problems to the notice of parliament and its committees through to their duly elected representatives. In this way they will be able to explain their briefs and seek amendments.

What we have at the present time is a government locked in cement, unwilling to hear its constituents and believing that an election is only an opportunity to change one dictator for another. That is not a satisfactory state of affairs for this nation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have heard a number of my friends in the official opposition mention consultation by the government with the people concerned with this legislation. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) know what I am going to say. Over the past weekend there was so much consultation by the government with people in Edmonton, Regina and Calgary that we could hardly stand it. They hit Regina like a plague of Russian thistles or grasshoppers or gophers. They were underfoot all over the place, consulting. It remains to be seen whether the representations made to them by my stock producers, the trade union movement, the National Farmers Union and a few other organizations will lead to results.

The people out west are pretty tough, especially those from Saskatchewan. They have gone through drought, floods, Russian thistle, grasshoppers, coyotes, Liberals and Tories for 50 years.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Not necessarily in that order.

Mr. Benjamin: We are all asking ourselves where these fellows were when we needed them last year and the year before, and the year before that. With all this consultation in these last few weeks, we do not know whether it is conversion on the road to Damascus or whether there is an election coming.

I hope the consultation will bear fruit. I hope a number of Liberal candidates in Alberta and Saskatchewan will get some of the results that members of parliament from the Liberal, Conservative and New Democratic parties have been trying to get for the past four years. I think of postal walks, guaranteed prices for farm products related to the cost of production, and such things. We will all be happy, including those of us on the opposition benches, if the consultation on the weekend bears fruit. We will just nominate some more Liberal candidates every four years to get results and then the rest of us can stay as members of parliament.

Aeronautics Act

My friends to my right mentioned user-pay. I notice that government spokesmen have been backing off that item lately. For the last few years I have been saying there is no mode of transportation in Canada where the user pays, and there never has been—not even pedestrians. Transportation has always been in a deficit position. As long as anybody clings to that concept our transportation systems will continue to discriminate against people because of where they live, and against products or produce because of where they are located.

During the debate on second reading of this bill, and in committee, we were reminded that there are three United States commercial air carriers who owe \$5.8 million for user charges on the North Atlantic routes. Initially, I sensed that my colleagues in the official opposition felt sorry for Trans World Air Lines, Pan American Air Lines and Seaboard Air Carriers. In committee, however, we learned that these and all other carriers pay the same type of charges to Iceland, Denmark and Great Britain, but for some reason or other, they do not want to pay Canada. The three airlines are contesting this bill of \$5.8 million in the federal court.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to wish the Department of Transport well. If these companies do not pay their accounts I hope they are refused landing rights, navigational aids and everything else at Gander and at other airports in the Atlantic provinces. All other airlines have been paying fees to other countries as well as Canada, but these companies have been trying to chisel us. I hope the ministry succeeds in defending our right to collect reasonable charges for services that Canadian taxpayers provide to all international airlines.

Another provision in the bill that we approve in principle is the land zoning regulations. The government's stated objective is to protect airports and airport sites from urban development encroaching upon their boundaries. We agree that the federal aviation authority should have control over the development of land near airports and as well the ownership of it.

● (2102)

We would make one exception, Mr. Speaker. If there was housing development on the land long before an airport was built, it is then a little late in the day for the government to move in and restrict or refuse to properly compensate people who were there long before there was an airport. I agree that when a new airport is built or a present one is enlarged the public aviation authority should own and control that land. No development should be allowed within a one-mile radius of that airport. It should be a green belt, or farmland or perhaps a golf course. But no construction should be allowed. There are examples in Canada where housing developments existed long before an airport was built. I am thinking particularly of the Stanley Park area of Thunder Bay. If there are four houses on eight lots, and someone wants to construct houses on the other four lots, it makes little or no difference whatsoever to the use of that present airport location. That is the kind of exception which should be made in the control the national aviation authority should have over development in and around public airports.