

*National Transportation Act, 1987*

legislation but without success. While the Bill provides something to deal with this, certainly Clause 3(1)(a) was the place where we could have dealt with it. The Government refused to budge. Indeed, I have no hesitation in saying that the Minister is compromising safety.

Let no one think that CALPA is alone in its safety concerns. I want to say this because of the vicious response by the Minister of Transport to my questions last Monday. I was asking something that I thought was absolutely responsible. I wanted to know if the Government was going to take every possible step to prevent the occurrence of an incident like the one in Detroit. The Minister tried to imply that we wanted to make politics out of a tragedy. It was not making politics because what happened in the U.S. could certainly happen in Canada. What I was saying on Monday is what the CALPA people have been saying along with a number of experts in the U.S. Let me cite them. *Canadian Aviation* is an important publication and it said in September, 1985:

All airlines are cutting corners these days. Sure there are safeguards but the risks are being cut a little finer in the interests of the bottom line.

James E. Burnett, Chairman of the U.S. National Transportation Safety Board, said in 1985:

Under-capitalized carriers cannot afford to invest as much in training as the well-established carriers, so that there is less familiarity with equipment and procedures.

Here is what Larry Crawford, President of Avitas said in *Airline Executive* in 1985:

The current trend among airlines towards maintaining aircraft only to minimum FAA standards is disturbing.

Here is what Donald Engen, administrator of the FAA, was saying in *Flight International* in November, 1985:

We cannot accept any tendency for people to move down to the minimum standards. Deregulation in itself isn't bad . . . But this is not to say we have no problem for the future.

This is precisely what we in Canada are saying. Contrary to the NDP, which is vehemently and totally opposed to deregulation, and to the Conservatives, who want to jump right to it in a massive and urgent deregulation, we in the Liberal Party are saying, "Just a minute. Deregulation to a certain degree is not bad. Certainly it could be done. But let us do it in a way that will not compromise the safety of people flying. We will not compromise the employment of those who have for years worked in the industry. We will not compromise services to the regions which are accustomed to a service that will no longer be available if there is no ironclad protection in the legislation". That is what we are saying. This industry, if it is totally deregulated, will only go where it can make a buck. It will not continue to serve the remote areas of our country who have been accustomed to the services. Finally, let us not do it in a way that will compromise safety as happened in the U.S. and as will happen in Canada unless we have the proper safeguards.

I am not the only one speaking this way. I want to cite another important organization, the Brotherhood of Railway

and Airline Clerks who appeared before the Standing Committee on Transport when it visited Vancouver in March of this year. Here is what they had to say with regard to safety:

—a number of other facts have many U.S. air safety experts worried about the future:

The number of near misses have increased steadily over the last five years—from 311 in 1982 to 776 in 1985; in the first five months of 1986, 305 were recorded, an increase over the same period in 1985.

While the number of commercial flights has grown by 31 per cent, from 14.7 million in 1980 to 19.2 million in 1986, the number of air traffic controllers has declined by 13 per cent.

While the number of aircraft increased by 68 per cent between 1980 and 1984, the percentage of operating revenues spent on maintenance has declined from 8.9 per cent in 1980 to 7.6 per cent in 1984.

Although there has been a dramatic increase in both the number of flights and passengers, the number of FAA inspectors has declined by 33.8 per cent between 1979 and 1984.

These statistics were presented to the committee to indicate that this trend in the U.S. should not happen in Canada. They urged the committee to make recommendations to the Minister to improve safety and make sure the number of inspectors in the Department would be sufficient to do a proper job. What we have witnessed so far is lip-service by the Minister. There has been no clear-cut indication that there are going to be more employees to do the work effectively. In his report to the House of Commons for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the Auditor General made the following remarks:

None of the Transport Canada regions was able to inspect all carriers in its jurisdiction at least once a year.

This is not a member of the Liberal Opposition speaking. This is the Auditor General of Canada. He is telling us that in 1985, under the Conservative Government, none of the Transport Canada regions were able to inspect all carriers in their jurisdiction at least once a year. The Government is going full steam with deregulation and it has not substantially increased the number of people to do the work. The Government is trying to pretend that it is not compromising safety. It is trying to pretend that the work will be done. When I asked the Minister a question in the House the other day—

[*Translation*]

Did the Minister know that the Department of Transport delegated—not: did the work itself—delegated authority to airline mechanical engineers to apply the standards it has laid down? I also asked the Minister whether it was normal to let the airline companies police themselves. The Minister answered:

—I find this question totally absurd from a Member who has had some experience in transportation . . . I invite him to reread the Aeronautics Act and to reread some of the actions which have been taken by the Government.

I reread the Aeronautics Act, but I have yet to see the Government's actions reflect it in the policies we need to implement the new legislation and ensure it will produce results. Until the Department or the agencies have the staff they need to do the work, these policies will be no more than wishful thinking on the part of the Government. We can