

Order Paper Questions

eight-hour day or more than a five-day week and, if so, what will be the definition?

3. Are commercial pilots often required by employers to fly in adverse or marginal weather conditions or to fly aircraft in over-loaded conditions or to operate aircraft upon which maintenance procedures have not been properly carried out and do employers threaten to dismiss them or threaten not to promote or recommend them if they refuse to fly and, if so, does the Minister of Transport intend to create an arbitration procedure to hear cases concerning commercial pilots who have been dismissed for refusing to fly unsafe aircraft and does the minister intend to give any arbitration board the power to reinstate the pilot and to order the employer to pay lost wages and damages?

Mr. Robert Bockstael (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. Duty time for pilots is presently covered by information circular 0/3/73 dated March 12, 1973, and which addresses duty time under two headings. Flight time is defined as "the total time from the moment an aircraft first moves under its own power for the purpose of taking off until the moment it comes to rest at the end of the flight".

Flight duty time is defined as: "the time necessary to prepare for, execute and terminate a flight or series of flights and the administrative functions associated therewith".

The information circular recommends the following flight time limitations: 120 hours in any month; 300 hours in any quarter; and 1,200 hours in any year. In addition, flight duty time is recommended to be normally limited to 15 hours in any day unless provisions are made to allow for increased times. (e.g. relief pilots carried on board the aircraft). The circular also recommends rest periods of eight consecutive hours of prone rest between periods of flight duty time.

Legislatively, Air Regulations section 411 (C.R.C. c.2) states: "No person shall act as a flight crew member and no operator shall require a person to act as a flight crew member if either the person or the operator has any reason to believe, having regard to the circumstances of the particular flight to be undertaken, that the person: (a) is suffering from or is likely to suffer fatigue, or (b) would be otherwise unfit to properly perform his duties."

Detailed questionnaires were sent to all commercial pilots in Canada to elicit their views on flight-time limitations, the results of which are now being analysed to determine the validity and effectiveness of existing flight-time guidelines and regulatory requirements.

3. Vol. II of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Aviation Safety states on page 361 that: "During the course of the inquiry . . . the commission learned of overloading, falsification of logbook entries, flying below legal limits in bad weather, pressure on pilots to push weather limits, pilots working hours greatly in excess of the established guidelines, maintenance engineers signing maintenance logs without the required work having been done, and other unsafe practices."

The question of follow-up action related to these findings, i.e. arbitration procedures, will be addressed by Justice Dubin in volume III.

MAINTENANCE OF AUTOMATIC RAILWAY SIGNALS

Question No. 3,303—Mr. Cossitt:

1. Did the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission receive a communication from the county engineer of the united counties of Leeds and Grenville objecting to the fact that CNR has been invoicing the united counties for the maintenance of automatic railway signals at county roads 5 and 9 in the constituency of Leeds-Grenville?

2. Is the railway out of service and, if so (a) what are all the reasons which justify making the municipality pay for the maintenance of signals where the railway does not operate (b) will the committee order the CNR to refund to the municipality any invoices paid since the railway ceased service in the area?

Mr. Robert Bockstael (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows:

1. Yes. Considering the comments of the county engineer for the united counties of Leeds and Grenville along with the present level of rail traffic, the continued requirement for the provision of automatic protection at the two county roads will be reviewed.

2. No. (a) and (b) Not applicable.

USE OF UNTRAINED FLIGHT ATTENDANTS

Question No. 3,323—Mr. Skelly:

1. Did volume II of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Aviation Safety state that the use of untrained flight attendants by airlines was a major safety hazard in the event of an emergency?

2. Did the Department of Transport waive or ignore normally accepted procedures in order to accommodate Wardair when that airline locked out its flight attendants and hired untrained people to take the jobs of the locked-out employees?

3. Does the minister intend to recommend legislation that will prevent airlines from leaving stranded employees away from home during a labour dispute by denying them passage home or by encouraging other carriers not to provide stranded employees with passage home?

Mr. Robert Bockstael (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes. Volume II of the inquiry, tabled in the House of Commons on October 22, 1981, referred to a particular case by stating "there were, therefore, serious safety implications in the event of an emergency" (page 469). This issue is also referred to in testimony (page 458).

2. No. The content and quality of the safety and emergency training was fully in accordance with Wardair's normal cabin attendant training program as approved by Transport Canada.

3. No.

VESSEL "MAISONNEUVE"

Question No. 3,365—Mr. Crosby:

1. During the years 1975 to 1980, did the Minister of Transport or any other Member of Parliament board the vessel *Maisonneuve* and, if so, on what date and for what reason?

2. During which months of the year does the vessel operate and how much of this time is spent in the promotion of the port of Montreal?

3. Does the minister consider that the expenditures for the maintenance of the vessel are a reasonable and prudent disbursement of public funds?