

*National Transportation Act, 1986*

were right . . . If you look at how things evolved and situations developed, you understand that there is an element of logic in the process, and whenever a situation has evolved and given good reasons to make adjustments, I feel the Liberal Party has always been able to adjust and take any corrective action and decision required to help every sector in Canada secure an excellent position.

Mr. Speaker, what the Liberal Party would not accept, however, is a reckless deregulation without due consultation process. One of the basic problems I find, after all the discussions I had and the speeches I heard, is this lack of consultation, this very selective process of consultation which leads to bills like the ones presented by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie).

Last week, I heard my colleague, the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart), say that a number of provinces were not even consulted on the document *Freedom to Move*. The Standing Committee, as he mentioned, did not have the time to consult Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Alberta and Saskatchewan. I would imagine, Mr. Speaker, that in these provinces there are groups and individuals involved in transportation who should have been consulted or heard, but unfortunately the Government did not do it and, today, we are confronted with a Bill we cannot agree with, as a number of groups have voiced strong concerns about it.

Despite all the objections raised by Liberal Members and others, even Conservative Members, in particular the Chairman of the Committee, about the very short time given to the Standing Committee to study *Freedom to Move*, the Conservative Party used its majority and went along with the Minister of Transport request for a speedy report. We deplore this decision made by the majority and, in keeping with its responsibilities as Official Opposition in this Parliament, the Liberal Party had to produce a minority report.

One of the basic aspects of the discussions or meetings we have had with interest groups, business people or companies which are opposed to or entertain serious reservations about this Bill is, of course, the role played by transportation in the promotion of employment opportunities, and the fears of these companies with respect to the impact this Bill might have on employment in Canada.

It is likely, indeed very likely that deregulation will be followed by a sharp decline in employment in Canada, and the attendant loss of wages, because we can expect a proliferation of non-unionized job openings on the labour market. Mr. Speaker, it was in 1978 that the Americans began deregulating their air transport industry and, between 1978 and 1982, full-time jobs in American air transport companies decreased by 6 per cent. From 1980 to 1985, 40,000 workers lost their jobs in that sector. We heard as well—and this was underscored last week—that airlines had to shut down because they were no longer subject to regulation. Among others, People's Express went bankrupt and folded their wings. They used to carry a lot of passengers, but deregulation made it impossible for

company management to meet their obligations, they just could not survive and decided to declare bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have also raised the question of safety in respect of deregulation as such. We did refer to safety because the Canadian Aviation Safety Board has raised the matter and stated that deregulation could lead to many accidents and an increased number of accident investigations if the deregulation legislation were to be adopted as it is now.

We have here a statement made by Mr. Bernard Deschênes in an interview reported in *La Presse* in which he says the Canadian Aviation Safety Board expects to investigate more than a thousand incidents and accidents in 1986. Of course, Mr. Deschênes is not looking forward to that, but it could be expected that the total number of accidents would return to the 700 yearly average after declining to around 500 during the recession. Added to that would then be more than 350 investigations on incidents that could have had serious consequences, whether engine failure, running out of fuel, near collision cockpit trouble, decompression requiring emergency descent, etc.

What we have pointed out last week, Mr. Speaker, is that deregulation will automatically lead to price competition. With this automatic price competition, there will be companies which, in order to stay afloat and go on operating, will try to save on operating costs, and when looking at operating cost reductions, they will automatically reduce certain costs probably in the area of safety. This means we will be faced with the kinds of situations described by Mr. Deschênes, most probably there will be serious problems in the area of safety-inspections or preventive maintenance that used to be done industry-wide for all transportation services in Canada. Then we may experience serious accidents, disasters that will be due to a kind of deregulation that will have failed to include standards, mechanisms or requirements for those carriers to have maintenance or safety standards that are complied with or that require regular inspections.

Mr. Speaker, we are sorry to note that the Standing Committee on Transportation has been given no mandate to deal with safety within the deregulation process. Indeed, many witnesses were amazed to learn that the Committee wanted to make its views known on deregulation without any analysis of safety standards. The Auditor General, Mr. Kenneth Dye, said, regarding the fiscal year ended March 31, 1985, that Transport Canada was not able, in any of the regions, to inspect all the carriers under its jurisdiction at least once a year.

And according once again to the Canadian Air Line Pilots' Association, we have reached the point where safety-related concerns became so pressing last year that the U.S. Transport Secretary ordered a white glove safety inspection.

So, Mr. Speaker, I only hope that before passing this Bill government will make some serious amendments and refer it to a committee.