

stances will he buy de Havilland shares for any price, and we have the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce telling us that he must have an estimate cleared and who, through trickery, gets it cleared through the Appropriation Act knowing that he has to make the deal by June 28 and he will do it or the deal is lost? Surely that is not being fair to the members of this House or to the public of Canada. What are they hiding in this de Havilland deal? For what reason will they not table the relevant documents and statements and in some way try to gain the confidence of this House which I sincerely believe they have lost? They need to gain the confidence of the House in the method they are using with respect to the purchase of these companies.

It may be that de Havilland is a good purchase and it may be that Canadair is a good purchase, but it would take a lot to convince me. But at least the people of Canada are entitled to see the profit and loss statements of these companies before we have this irresponsible trickery on the part of a minister who feels he is entitled to the confidence of the House.

Those are the reasons for which I have risen to speak on the motion before us. I believe that the CN financing bill is one which we have no alternative but to scrutinize closely, particularly when we are treated in the way I have indicated with regard to the purchase of a new Crown corporation by this government. How can one have confidence when one looks at these companies and finds that, while there is a nominal profit in relation to capital in Air Canada of \$17 million before taxes, there is a deficit of \$17.8 million in the CNR? Then one is told to go ahead and pass the CN financing legislation when we know that in all likelihood some of the silliest imaginable deals will be made unless someone in the House calls it for what it is. We were "had" on the oil purchase last November, and we are going to be "had" on the purchase of shares in June, or before if members of the House do not realize what is going on.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, in rising to debate the motion before us I wish to speak about Air Canada operations. It is ironic that Air Canada celebrated its thirty-fifth anniversary yesterday and in a news release from the Department of Transport the minister's message reads:

Air Canada today enjoys a reputation second to none in world aviation for flight safety and good service.

I cannot agree with that statement at all. I would suggest that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) consult the employees of Air Canada, speak to the general public and to members of parliament. I also suggest that he review the *Hansard* index, when he will see how many times Air Canada has been the subject of criticism in the House. Also, I suggest that he read the 70-page document which contained condemning criticism of Air Canada from A to Z. Of course, we all know the number of strikes that Air Canada has had over the past number of years, and I bring that fact also to the attention of the minister.

One aspect which I would like to discuss this evening is air safety in Air Canada. Last fall, Air Canada stated that a safety study had been undertaken in conjunction with the unions, and the committee on transport and communications was told that everything was O.K. The committee

Canadian National Railways and Air Canada

was informed by Mr. Pratte that air safety was controlled by employees filing union grievances. We were told that unions had no safety complaints. I would like to quote from a newspaper article which reads as follows:

—Yves Pratte, chairman of the airline, told the committee the allegations were not based on any facts since employees "who have any doubt about any safety feature, have an obligation to report their doubts to their union safety officer and have it processed as a grievance."

However, no worker had reported any safety preoccupations of any kind in the past year, so that the allegations could not possibly be founded.

I will prove otherwise as I have documents that were submitted to Air Canada on safety infractions at Dorval. In the latest airline lodge news there appears a complaint from the employees at Dorval which I would like to read into the record. It states:

Unfortunately, the shop stewards in customer service have to deal with first level Air Canada supervisors that are not interested in resolving grievances or applying the collective agreement. The supervisors' only concern is trying to run a schedule operation at all costs. The result of this attitude causes one of our largest problems and most frequent violation of the collective agreement, i.e. 'SAFETY'. The collective agreement is quite clear in that management is specifically charged with the duty of initiating and monitoring all practices necessary to ensure the safety and health of employees as well as ensuring the safety of all equipment.

Because of the attitude of first level supervision and their refusal to initiate safety, the shop committee is presently handling the problem at the second level of the grievance procedure which is the regional vice-president or his designated representative.

Last fall I read into the record a complaint from a lady in Vancouver who stated:

On November 23, 1973, I boarded Air Canada's flight 280 to attend an archaeological symposium at the University of Calgary. Within twenty minutes of take-off, I experienced that sense of continuous "ear popping" (for want of a proper medical term). The aircraft became instantly chilled and to my horror, the oxygen cabinets opened and we were instructed to use the orange masks. You can well imagine the anxiety especially among the more aged passengers. In addition, not all the masks produced oxygen. The man sitting next to me tried in vain to operate his, but without success.

Now if Air Canada's flights are so well supervised during maintenance and repair, why was this overlooked?

Apparently the problem still exists in Air Canada. You would think they would take immediate action to rectify it. Last Tuesday, March 26, an Air Canada flight out of Quebec City while climbing at 14,000 feet lost cabin pressure. Of the masks deployed, only 40 per cent supplied oxygen. So the problem is still with us. Last fall, eight employees at Dorval submitted a document to the maintenance quality supervisor of Air Canada. This was signed by four former Manitobans and four Quebecers. I should like to read some of their comments into the record as follows:

It is our opinion that the quality audit program has not been thoroughly and adequately developed. Many managers, lead mechanics, mechanics and others are not fully aware of the quality audit program and its objectives. It is not sufficient just to have an 862 Maintenance Quality Manual; shop personnel must be made aware of the basics of the inspection function. Either 901 Manual instructions or other means to inform personnel is considered necessary.

In our opinion the quality audit program is not working as it was designed to do. In one or two areas it is receiving token acceptance but no efforts are made to prevent discrepancies from reoccurring, e.g., errors reported are given attention but that is all that is done. In some areas, virtually no attention is given to audit reports—as evidenced by quality audit annual summaries.