

Committee on Railways and Shipping

on December 17 near Brampton, Ontario. Just as there has been wide discussion of things that some members felt the government should do about radio, with those long appeals for a separate regulatory body and things like that which had not been mentioned in the motion but which some members felt were relevant to the question, I submit that in the same way it is relevant to the affairs of Trans-Canada Air Lines for me to say that, in my view, there has not yet been a proper and satisfactory inquiry into the crash that took place at Brampton last December and which is mentioned in the accounts and reports that are to be referred to the committee. I admit, as I said a moment ago, that I could have raised this matter as a grievance on a motion to go into supply. Your Honour is nodding your head. If the upshot of all this is that you compel me to cease going ahead with this matter, that is when I shall do it. But it seems to me that it is relevant to this question and that it might be better, in the long run, if I finished the speech now rather than having to start it all over again when we reach that other stage in our proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, the hon. member having gone so far, if one is to be practical I suppose we might as well allow the hon. member to conclude. But my difficulty is that if I allow the hon. member to take a sideroad as far as relevancy is concerned, then I must allow all hon. members to do likewise if they wish to do so. That is my problem. At this moment I am somewhat puzzled. I know that some agreements are made and discussions of a general character take place on motions of this kind. I have indicated one, namely the motion to set up the committee on the C.B.C. But I submit that, by agreement, hon. members should not change the rules that it is my duty to ask hon. members to observe. In discussing a motion to set up a committee for a certain purpose, I do not see how it could be relevant to ask the Minister of Transport, before he sees this motion passed, to create a board of inquiry to investigate a crash in a certain district. I do not see it, but I will let the hon. member carry on a little further and see whether my mind cannot be changed.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I have every respect for the statement you have just made that your mind cannot be changed, because I am equally convinced that this subject is relevant. However, in view of what you have said, I will make my remarks shorter than I had otherwise intended in the hope that, if not today certainly within the next few days, the minister will respond to my request and

[Mr. Knowles.]

set up a public board of inquiry, thus making it unnecessary for me to raise the matter again. If the matter is not dealt with satisfactorily in the next little while, I may find it necessary to raise it again on the motion to go into supply.

The reason I am not satisfied with the report tabled by the minister which was made by the technical board of inquiry is that, although it puts the blame for the accident on the so-called or alleged negligence of the pilot, I feel that the board itself has been negligent in not including in its report all of the facts of the case. Some hon. members may have seen the statements I have made to the press regarding this matter and will be familiar with what is in my mind. Precisely because I have made statements to the press I do not need to spell it out quite so fully here.

The report suggests that there was really no element of fatigue that could lead to the alleged negligence of the pilot. In my view the report goes out of its way to make out that the pilot had not had too difficult a week previous to the time of the crash. I have in mind particularly the statement on page xv of the report which says:

Approximately one week prior to the flight in question Captain Ramsay returned from leave. During the ensuing week he made one round trip to Bermuda and two round trips to Tampa, involving a total flying time for the three trips of 43 hours. He was off duty for two days, on Tuesday and on Thursday, the day prior to the flight in question. Captain Ramsay spent Thursday evening quietly.

Anyone who reads those few sentences will gain the impression that the captain of this trip had had not too hard a week. He had had, so the report seems to suggest, a week involving only three trips. Actually the words are "approximately one week" and the reference is to "three trips". The fact of the matter is that in a period of six days Captain Ramsay made four trips. The report suggests in the sentences I have just read that he had had two days off before the trip to Tampa which resulted in the crash on the way back. True, it does say that those two days were Tuesday and Thursday, but the way in which the report glosses over what had happened on Wednesday is, I suggest, a case of negligence, on the part of the authors of this report.

The fact of the matter is that this pilot had made a trip on Sunday from Montreal to Toronto, on to Bermuda and back to Toronto. On Monday he made a trip from Toronto to Florida and back to Toronto and Montreal. On Wednesday he made a trip from Montreal to Toronto, on to Florida and back to