

*Aeronautics Act*

airworthiness and safety. The same is true of trains and ships.

I should like to make brief mention of another subject though still staying on the point I have raised on second reading of this bill. Let us just see what happened regarding the unfortunate air crash at Ste. Thérèse just over two years ago. I have made brief mention of this matter before in the house. Over 100 people were killed in that unfortunate crash. The federal government through the Department of Transport commenced to reassemble the aircraft at the scene of the accident piece by piece. The operation was continued at Dorval airport. A judicial inquiry was held. I have made some very general investigations, Mr. Speaker, but I think I am correct in saying that when you look at the costs incurred by the National Research Council and the Department of Transport you will find approximately \$5 million was spent on research into the cause of this accident.

I do not think I will be out of order if I say in passing that every week in Canada over 100 people die on our highways. After the ambulance or morgue wagon has removed the bodies the wrecks are towed away. But not one single cent is spent on research into the cause of highway deaths and injuries.

In closing may I say that we owe a great debt of thanks to government officials and to the aircraft industry for the wonderful safety record they have had up to now. Though I have said that we can expect much progress in the future, the fact is that they have a great safety record. But it is only great because of the millions and millions of dollars which have been spent on research, thus enabling the minister to talk of safety regulations in the manner he has this afternoon.

It has been pointed out this afternoon that aircraft come under the rule of law. We shall probably be discussing during this session the fact that ships are under the rule of law just as in a matter of weeks we will be discussing the fact that rolling stock on our railways are under the rule of law. It is my hope that the day is not too far distant when millions and millions of dollars will be spent on research into deaths and injuries caused by highway accidents. I hope that in the same way as we are discussing safety in relation to aircraft we will be discussing safety regulations relating to federal control over the production of automobiles and obligation upon manufacturers to incorporate scientifically proven safety features in automobiles at the production level.

[Mr. Graftey.]

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we cannot do this today because we have not established jurisdiction. We have not even prepared any findings in this regard because nothing has yet been spent on research into the problem. Again I return to the fact, which I have probably repeated two or three times this afternoon, that we are only able to enter into a discussion of safety with the minister today on second reading of this bill because over many years we have acted federally in a positive way in regard to this matter.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to keep the house from hearing the minister but there are one or two observations I intended to make. While realizing that we do not discuss the various sections, on second reading nonetheless I feel that during the course of my remarks I must make reference to a couple of matters that were dealt with by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). I express the hope that the minister will have been impressed with these arguments and will make the necessary changes to meet the criticisms advanced by the hon. member for Yukon.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I must say that I am impressed with some portions of these amendments, particularly those that deal with the establishment of a board of inquiry to investigate the situation respecting any accident involving an aircraft. While in the past there have been investigations, the lack of power in the holding of an investigation was apparent on more than one occasion, and I think this new provision is an admirable advance. However, there is one section to which I take the strongest possible objection. We must not as a parliament advance the rights of ministers to the point of actually making laws. That is what we are doing in this case. The Governor in Council, of course, must have the power to make regulations. This is incidental to the exercise of the necessary authority to carry out the general principle inherent in the legislation, and it is always so. But I cannot conceive what reason impels the government to ask for the power that any regulations made may authorize the minister to make orders or directions with respect to such matters coming within this section as the regulations may prescribe.

This is a power that is not needed. We have dealt with this point on more than one occasion. We must resist the continuing invasion of the legislative rights of parliament by