

Further along in the article, we read the following:

—there were 1,144 flight delays daily in 1986 and 367,000 delays throughout the year.

Let me ask Members of Parliament who live away from Ottawa and who try to get home on a fairly regular basis how they would like to have the kinds of delays that U.S. passengers experience. They will, Mr. Speaker, experience these types of delays once Bill C-18 comes into force.

Bill C-18, Mr. Speaker, does nothing to meet the concerns of the Canadian railways in terms of opening their traffic to U.S. competition without any reciprocal concessions from U.S. carriers. That is typical of this Government, Mr. Speaker. It bargains when it shouldn't bargain; and when it bargains, it bargains badly when it comes to the interests and concerns of the Canadian people.

This Bill does nothing to meet the concerns of Canadian truckers, who are aware that U.S. deregulation in that sector has brought intense competition for truckload shipments but very little for less than truckload shipments.

Steinbach, which is a few miles from Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, is headquarters for many of the major trucking companies in Canada. I know the owners and managers of those companies, and no one could be further away from the philosophy of the New Democratic Party than those owners and managers. For the first time in my years in Parliament, Mr. Speaker, I find myself advocating the same position, the same point of view, as the owners and managers of the trucking companies.

The Manitoba Trucking Association, the Ontario Trucking Association, and the Canadian Trucking Association have all voiced opposition and criticism in relation to major clauses of this Bill. The New Democratic Party is opposed to this Bill, Mr. Speaker. We are totally unconvinced of the Progressive Conservative ideology that the free market offers solutions. We are totally unconvinced that deregulation will lead to a comprehensive and efficient transportation system for Canada.

Let us look at some of the problems which should be dealt with by this Bill but which are ignored. Let us start with railway safety, something which has been a long-time preoccupation in Canada. We have tens of thousands of miles of rail lines in Canada. We have a small population. The rail lines are used frequently. We have had too many accidents, some of which, Mr. Speaker, have been very serious.

The lack of safety provisions, Mr. Speaker, in Bill C-18, the lack of provisions which would force the railways to operate as safely as they should, the fact that the need for competition will cut back on the already too few safety precautions taken in terms of the maintenance of rail stock and rail lines in this country, means that we are going to see more rather than fewer accidents.

• (2140)

The fear that there will be more accidents and more problems has been voiced by many people in the railway

National Transportation Act, 1986

workforce—carmen, maintenance of way, shop crafts, and operating crews. In order to cut costs and to reduce personnel, the railways are moving to substitute, increasingly, technological solutions for safety problems.

I should like to quote just a couple of paragraphs from an article which appeared in the May 1, 1987 edition of *The Toronto Star* entitled "Layoffs signal rail disaster unions charge" and written by Pat McNenly. In part the article reads:

Canadian National Railways without fanfare has switched the inspection of freight trains and their hazardous cargoes from experienced carmen to members of the train crew at many check points across Canada.

It continues:

Since 1980 the reassignment of inspection duties and the installation of rail-side electronic devices to detect "hot boxes" (overheated wheel bearings) have cost 2,250 carmen jobs in CP Rail and another 1,900 CN jobs.

It goes on to explain that carmen serve a five-year apprenticeship and knew what they were doing. CN has now cut back on carmen, and the prediction is that there will be many more accidents.

Let us look at what is happening with air traffic controllers. Perhaps no issue is more controversial or vital to the travelling public. A few minutes ago I spoke about what was happening in the United States as a result of deregulation. We have seen a dramatic increase in U.S. air traffic, and we have seen a similar increase in Canada. Each deregulated airline in the United States wants to fly at the optimum peak period time. They want to get as many customers as they can.

U.S. air traffic controllers are understaffed and greatly overworked as a result of the firing of air traffic controllers a few years ago by President Reagan. What is happening in Canada? The same conditions are now being replicated with lay-offs of air traffic controllers at a time of increasing air traffic.

I should now like to quote from an article which appeared in the June 3, 1987 edition of the *Winnipeg Free Press* entitled "Job-cut proposal angers air traffic controllers". I want Hon. Members on the government side to keep in mind what I pointed out is happening in the United States. In part the article reads:

A federal consultant's report recommends Transport Canada eliminate 17 of 99 air traffic control jobs in the Winnipeg control area.

It continues:

CATCA vice-president Carl Fisher said the proposed cuts come at a time when controllers in the Winnipeg control area have handled 27 per cent more traffic in the first quarter of this year (57,543 aircraft) than in the same quarter of 1984—

Then the article goes on to say:

"It is only a matter of time before we have a major disaster on our hands," said Jack Butt, president of the 19,000-member CATCA. "There is Russian roulette in air traffic control."

If that is happening in Winnipeg, one can imagine that the situation in Toronto is much more serious and much more dangerous. There has been a number of near misses in many Canadian cities.