

Adjournment Debate

An article in the Ottawa *Citizen* of July 17, 1980, headed "Airlines Ordered to Probe Possible Jet Engine Flaws" reads in part:

Major Canadian airlines are being advised to look for defects in Pratt and Whitney engines in their DC-9, Boeing 727, and Boeing 737 passenger jets after an engine on a Hawaiian Airline plane broke apart on take-off last month.

The situation in Canada is deteriorating. We are far below American standards. I have here a recent letter written by a private pilot to the editor which was published in *The Globe and Mail* on October 13, 1980. In it he discusses the antiquated equipment used in the control towers. He does not blame the air traffic controllers because it has nothing to do with them. The matter has to do with the Minister of Transport and his department, not his employees. He went into great detail to explain about the outdated equipment in our control towers. He says in part:

The term 'inefficiency' does not refer directly to the air traffic controllers, but to the rules, regulations and equipment they (ATC) have to work with. I can sympathize with a controller who has to work with antiquated equipment, just as I, as a pilot, might have to fly an aircraft without such sophisticated instrumentation—

I hope we will receive a firm commitment from the parliamentary secretary tonight because the Canadian public is entitled to such a statement.

Mr. Robert Bockstael (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's interest and concern in aviation safety is most welcome. The subject of aviation safety is one that has been prominent in the public's mind during the hearings held by the Dubin commission across the country.

Perhaps I could take this opportunity to mention the progress of these hearings. The commission has completed five of the six phases of its inquiry, namely, airworthiness, accident investigation and reporting, enforcement, navigational aids and uncontrolled airports. The final phase, now in progress, concerns personnel.

The hearings, as members know, have taken place in many cities and have listened to testimony from a large number of groups and individuals. So great was the interest in this inquiry that the minister recently granted Mr. Dubin an extension to his mandate which would otherwise have expired this month.

This raises the question of a report on the commission's findings. It is now our understanding that Mr. Dubin intends to release a series of reports beginning early in 1981, rather than a single final report. This will allow public discussion on each aspect of the inquiry as the findings appear. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that it will also allow the department to undertake prompt action on Mr. Dubin's recommendations.

The hon. member raises several specific issues on which evidence has been presented to the commission. The minister has stated several times, and I would emphasize again, that it would not be prudent to take hasty action on the basis of separate pieces of evidence alone. It is only reasonable to hear the counter-evidence and the conclusions of the inquiry itself after it has weighed consideration of all the testimony. It is our

hope that the findings of the commission will lead to a safer environment for air travel.

Mr. McKenzie: Are you taking the train home this weekend, Bob?

Mr. Bockstael: I take the airplane just as you do.

HUMAN RIGHTS—INQUIRY AS TO DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to follow up a question which I asked in this House on May 9, 1980. The question was directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in the absence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien). I asked when the government intended to implement the recommendations of the Canadian Human Rights Commission including, specifically, the recommendations regarding the adding of prescribed grounds of discrimination. I outlined the various recommendations of the Human Rights Commission which were made in its most recent annual report, that was tabled in March, 1980.

● (2220)

At that time the Prime Minister indicated that while he had not had an opportunity to examine the report himself, he hoped that the Minister of Justice would reply some time the following week. He also indicated that the government was seriously considering establishing a special committee of the House which would have a mandate to consider the various recommendations of the Canadian Human Rights Commission in its most recent annual report.

As we know, to date the Minister of Justice has not indicated in this House what action he intends to take on the recommendations of the Human Rights Commission. Of course, the government has not yet tabled any recommendations for a special committee as I proposed, and as did the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to consider these important recommendations of the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

I would like briefly to summarize the present mandate of the Canadian Human Rights Commission so that we might be aware of it. I am sure most Canadians recognize the importance of the job it is doing on behalf of all Canadian citizens, particularly minority groups within Canada.

As of December 31, 1979, the Canadian Human Rights Commission had had some two years of experience in administering a very new federal Human Rights Act. Under the terms of that act they have a mandate to investigate alleged discrimination pursuant to various proscribed forms of discrimination. Those proscribed forms of discrimination are outlined in section 2 of the act as follows, and I should just like to cite these for the House. They are on grounds of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, marital status, conviction for which a pardon has been granted and, in matters related to employment, physical handicap.