

think we are stretching the whole definition of emergency.

So there are large problems with respect to the local area. There is also the problem that when people complain their complaints go nowhere.

We have been advocating on this side of the House, as has the community, that a noise ombudsman of some sort be appointed. It would at least give the people in the riding or the communities surrounding Pearson the pleasure and the satisfaction that their message is getting through rather than talking to some tape machine which causes incredible amounts of frustration.

As well, I have asked the government and the minister to look at a special program, an insulation program that has been advocated by the Denver community surrounding the Denver airport that has worked very well. They have modern, up-to-date noise insulation which takes into account the type of noise pollution in communities surrounding airports. I am hopeful that the minister in due course will respond in a way that brings some degree of relief and satisfaction.

• (1520)

I was going to talk about the whole question of the investigation and the report on the Dryden crash, but I will leave that to my colleague, the transport critic. He will be touching on a number of variables therein.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to join my colleague in support of his motion, the motion condemning the government for abandoning Canada's transportation industry.

At the outset I want to suggest that we are really talking generically in terms of government, because the situation we find ourselves in today, quite frankly, was started before the current government took power. The Winnipeg member, still in this House, back in 1983-84, I believe it was, indicated that Air Canada, then a Crown corporation, and CN, still a Crown corporation, should act as if they were in the private sector and that certainly set the scene for an approach to transportation.

Leading up to the 1984 election, the member from Winnipeg also started the process of deregulation. In

fact, in Justice Moshansky's report tabled yesterday, one of the first warnings that came forward in Transport Canada from the front line troops, as the Justice referred to them, was in the spring of 1984, well before this government was successful at the polls later that year. Those front line troops warned that we did not have the resources to deal properly with deregulation, in whatever form.

The last two days we have been seized in this House, and I suspect across the country, with Justice Moshansky's report. Those of us who have been involved in the deregulation fight since 1984, and in the case of my colleague from Regina—Lumsden well before that, see a lot in the report that we warned people about.

When you take away the economic stability that our carriers had—and when I say economic stability I mean that there was some certainty in the routes that they would serve, there was some certainty in the kind of revenue that they would get, and at the same time the consumer had some certainty that the airline could not arbitrarily raise the fees or the ticket prices.

Also the communities that were served knew that there was protection for them as well, that a carrier could not on its own decide what kind of equipment to use to service that community and what kind of frequency to provide flights to that community. In both cases, the consumer and the community through a public process could attempt to block any changes. Obviously the CTC at the time had the responsibility to adjudicate that.

By taking it out of the realm of stability, we did a number of things as a society. We created the climate for cut-throat competition, where the bottom line became the driving force behind the decision-making of the airlines, and the rail and the road.

As we said during the debates on the white paper *Freedom to Move* and during the debate on the National Transportation Act and the companion pieces of legislation, it was the banker who made those safety decisions. It was not the regulator, it was not the government, it was not necessarily the carrier, it was the banker. The banker would be the one who would really decide whether a new company could be formed, that as long as you were fit, willing and able you would get a licence.