

*Government Orders*

commercial airport. It is a very serious question. Is that part of the goal of this policy?

I am straying from my original plan. We are concerned about the impact on the operation of a national airport system. We are concerned about losing the ability to do the kind of cross-subsidization that occurs today, where larger airports are helping to pay for the operation of the smaller ones. We are concerned about hubbing. The hon. member who spoke before me talked at great length about how great hubbing was. He made reference with regard to the open skies to stop having to go Ottawa to Toronto to the U.S.A. I do not know where he has been, because about three or four weeks ago I went from Ottawa right into the States on U.S. Air. That service is there.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am sick and tired—and this is no offence to the city of Toronto or Pearson Airport—of going Ottawa-Toronto-Thunder Bay and Thunder Bay-Toronto-Ottawa. We no longer have direct services which we had before deregulation.

One of the problems in this country—and it is part of the congestion problem at Pearson—is that so much is focusing through Toronto it is adding congestion upon congestion. It is creating the pressures that the Liberal member was talking about to expand the airport, to add additional runways to deal with the ever increasing growth of air traffic through there, as opposed to this government taking its responsibility and saying: “Yes, we need to have some controls”.

• (1710)

We have to put some controls back into air. It was done in the United States. They started to re-control entry and exit in terms of landing rights and when one could fly. It was not through a monetary system, but it was basically saying: “Here is when you should fly” so that the burden could be spread across the full day rather than have the situation where you have some peak times.

We are also seeing the situation where in spite of the rhetoric of this government, rhetoric it has used time and time again when it says that safety shall not be compromised, there is no guarantee that a local airport authority is not going to put a building in such a place that it not directly jeopardizes safety but in the long term prevents the kind of modifications needed for the tower area and

for fire-fighting areas and creates a situation where safety may be compromised.

It promised us that safety would not be compromised. All one has to do is read the transcript of the Dryden inquiry to see what really has happened. All one has to do is look at what has happened in Dryden. The Government of Canada, because jets no longer fly into Dryden, is going to eliminate fire-fighting services on a full-time basis.

There are situations where we still do not have the de-icing procedures at Pearson airport that were recommended. It was pointed out under the current situation that by the time the airplanes get to the take-off point they have been de-iced too long ago, that they should be going back to be de-iced again, but that they are taking off instead. It is an accident waiting to happen.

There are situations where Transport Canada officials are saying in testimony before the Dryden inquiry that they had no one on staff who could tell whether or not a particular plane was safe, that no one in Transport Canada had the expertise to make that determination.

We have had other reports which have indicated very clearly that the government knew it was not prepared for deregulation but went ahead with it anyway. I can appreciate a desire of the government to move forward with a political philosophy. I can understand in terms of its background in trying to ensure an unfettered marketplace. It does not seem to have worked in Canada. The reality of the situation is that it is getting worse and not better.

Let me deal briefly with the question of the employees. That is what this bill is about: how we treat the employees. It is appropriate to have legislation setting that out very clearly in the event that the government moves ahead with this policy as to how Crown employees should be treated.

In his statement on November 7 the minister said: “Permanent employees must be offered work by the local airport authorities with pay and benefit comparable to what they received in Transport Canada. It is a fundamental principle of the airport transfer process that the employees be fairly treated by the local airport authorities.”

Does this mean that they are guaranteed whatever the federal Public Service union gets until the time they retire? No. It just means until their current contract is up. That current contract, depending on when the