

this matter will be taken into account when the regulations are drafted and when they are being enforced.

The parliamentary secretary, of course, has made it clear that this registry does not in any way guarantee title. He also made it clear that it establishes a strict priority system. The government's policy in protecting the rights of those involved in the air line industry and of owners and pilots of smaller aircraft has not been as constructive as it might have been.

I was happy to note, although this is strictly not germane to this legislation, that there was an overhaul of provisions governing air service fees and increases in landing fees. What was done was good. I think this bill will provide encouragement to those engaged in the aircraft industry at a time when they need some encouragement.

Let me say one more thing. Clause 19 says, "this Act shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation." I hope the actions of the past will not serve a precedent and I hope that there will not be a delay of 25 years in bringing the provisions of this bill into effect.

● (1500)

I hope the government will not bury the bill but will proceed with it in a simple, effective, expedient manner and enact it into law in the not too distant future. The regulations will be the whole key to how well this legislation works, particularly on the domestic scene. Unless the regulations, the court procedures and the jurisprudence developed as a result of the bill are clear, inexpensive, convenient, well publicized and universally used, this legislation will not be nearly as useful as it might otherwise be.

In conclusion, I welcome this piece of legislation and hope it will be dealt with in an expedient manner. We look forward to considering it at a later stage.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the opening remarks of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Guay) when he said that this bill was aimed at removing legal complexities. After listening to his speech and looking at the bill, I wonder which is more complex, the present situation or the situation as it will be after the bill has been passed. On the other hand, when I learned, both from looking at the bill and listening to the parliamentary secretary, that one of the main purposes of this bill is to replace what we now have, namely a central aircraft register, with what will be known as a central aircraft registry, I realized that this is a very important piece of legislation.

All that aside, I join the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) in making the inescapable comment that this government does not rush into things. After all, this bill arises out of an international convention that was adopted on June 19, 1948. Twenty-five years later, something is being done about that international convention. However, as the hon. member for Central Nova and others know, there are other international conventions, notably some of those passed at the International Labour Organization, which have been around much longer than 25 years and to which Canada has not yet agreed.

Aircraft Registry Act

In any case, we recognize the need for this kind of legislation so that problems connected with the ownership of aircraft, operating as they do among the various countries of the world, can be settled on a basis that is covered by an international agreement. For that reason we are pleased to see this legislation before us and we see no reason why it should take an undue length of time to deal with it in this House. Since this bill deals only with the narrow subject of the ownership of aircraft we are prohibited from getting into other matters we would like to discuss, such as bilateral agreements between this country and the United States, and so on. I simply make the statement that we cannot do that at this time but must limit ourselves to what is before us.

It was comforting to learn from the parliamentary secretary that the rights of seizure of aircraft which are provided for in this legislation will not apply to an aircraft in flight. I am sure the next time he and I are flying together between here and our favourite province of Manitoba, we will be able to console ourselves with the fact that we passed this bill so no one can seize the aircraft while we are in flight.

This bill is exactly what the parliamentary secretary said, something dealing with legal complexities relating almost exclusively to the ownership of aircraft. Because there is an international convention to which Canada should have adhered long ago, we are glad to give our support to this bill so that Canada can now give its adherence to that convention.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I join the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) and the previous speaker in expressing support for this measure which is long overdue. It will give protection to people who have a financial interest or otherwise in aircraft. As the parliamentary secretary said, the legislation is long overdue in light of the growing transportation industry and the building of aircraft in Canada for sale within this country and for export.

As our transportation industry grows and we find a rationalization for a system of either centralization or decentralization, we will not only need this type of legislation but I am sure the parliamentary secretary is aware that we will need legislation in a number of other areas. Canada has the potential of achieving very considerable progress in the area of construction and sale of aircraft in the western world. This will come about when confidence in the industry is demonstrated by measures such as this.

As the hon. member for Central Nova stated, we have little or no quarrel with this bill. However, there are one or two aspects of it about which we might wonder. A distinguished gentleman in the place to which some of us might aspire considered many of the pertinent questions with regard to what we might expect in terms of regulations under this bill. On a number of occasions in this chamber we have voiced concern with regard to legislation and the form regulations might take, their impact and consequences, as opposed to a statement of policy which this bill is in fact.

One area of concern involves framework or authority of the Federal Court. Why are other levels of court authority excluded from hearing applications under the legislation?