

provide the services. We then get cut-backs in air traffic control. We can no longer get flights after 7 p.m. because the Government is not willing to staff them. There are no flights in after dark because there is no air traffic control. The fire department in the area has been cut back with a resulting loss of jobs. Perhaps that means nothing to a community of one million or even 100,000, but certainly for a community of 60,000, the loss of those jobs means a lot.

Those of us from the Province of British Columbia, particularly the interior of the province, object to this whittling away of our services. The Government is whittling away services through deregulation and Government cut-backs to the airports and transportation services. This makes it more and more difficult for those of us who live in those areas to have viable industries, to continue to build population and to give jobs to our children in the future. It has wide and vast ramifications for those in small communities throughout the Okanagan region.

Madam Speaker, the thrust of the Bill before us is a good one. Something must be done, and it appears that the Government is coming part way. That is to be applauded, but improvements can be made. I implore Government Members to look at those projected improvements that will be put forward by those on the committee and to listen carefully to those on the opposition benches who know and are experienced in this area and who are willing to help the Government. I ask Government Members and the Minister not to turn their backs, to listen to what is being said and to listen to how this is affecting others. If they listen, I am sure they will find the ideas are plausible. They will find that the suggestions we have come up with are workable. They will find that we have the best interests of Canadians at heart as well.

I ask the Government to please listen so that we can help the Government ensure the safety of Canadians through this Bill, through proper appointment of the board, for all Canadians into the future.

• (1640)

**Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** I wish to put a question to the previous speaker who gave an informed and eloquent speech on the problems of safety created by the Conservative Government. Would the Hon. Member comment on the proposition that the Conservative Government is driving up the costs to general aviation so drastically that it is creating a major safety

#### *Transportation Accident Investigation Board*

hazard? I would like to give a couple of examples for the Hon. Member to ruminate upon.

First, a voltage regulator used in smaller aircraft, which is made by the Ford Motor Company to put into a car, costs \$14. If it is put into an airplane and bought from the Cessna dealer, it costs \$140. The same applies to an alternator and many other common components. Those costs are so high that other items are neglected by owners.

The second issue I wish to address is cost-recovery programs put in place by Transport Canada. They drive up the costs enormously. At airports such as the one in Ottawa, the cost of parking an aircraft has gone very close to \$1,000, which is unconscionable gouging of the operators of general aviation.

In Vancouver the necessity to instal an encoding altimeter in aircraft has been moved up to July, 1989. It should cost every aircraft owner who wants to use that airport somewhere between \$500 and \$1,000 to instal it, because they have determined that it is a major installation, rather than allowing it to be installed by an AME. Indeed, the process of moving that requirement up from 1990 to 1989 will cause enormous hardship to aircraft owners.

Again, the Conservative Government cost recovery is unnecessary and thoughtless regulation. In the case of the encoding altimeter, hundreds if not thousands of aircraft will be denied access to Vancouver because for those encoding altimeters there are not enough avionics shops in British Columbia to service the aircraft and instal them in the limited time available.

This type of regulation and this type of cost recovery, the failure to deal with the major problems at Vancouver, the parallel runway, enough air traffic controllers, and proper reorganization of the air space, means that the Government will deny access to an airport which is absolutely unjustified. It is going to drive up the costs enormously to the operators of smaller general aviation type aircraft. The proposal is to drive that sector out of business by cost increases and by regulation that is not required, and also deny them access to airports that, if proper resources had been expended on them, would be accessible for aircraft of all types for many years to come.

The basic concept I wish to relay to the Hon. Member today is, does he believe that these are justified, and does he believe this is not only driving people out of general aviation but also causing a major safety hazard?