

● (2132)

A task force was set up by the department when it admitted that ELT's were causing more problems than they were worth. That is when the department ordered the ELT's out of the aircraft. After having forced 17,000 owners to put these instruments in their aircraft, the department passed an order telling them to take them all out. At no time was there any mention of compensation for what they were doing.

Recently the department issued a news release saying it had decided on an interim solution to the ELT problem. What the department said was that it waived the specifications I quoted a few moments ago, coming up with a new specification of 50 hours and minus 20° Celsius. This degradation of specifications, while not that much different, allowed the use of standard batteries, not lithium but low temperature alkaline or magnesium battery packs. These new battery packs are considerably larger and in some cases require alterations to the aircraft to instal them.

Three manufacturers have been named as having acceptable non-lithium ELT's, and the Department of Transport has a set of regulations for installing them. However, these provide only a temporary solution, and I want to make the point that this is only a temporary solution. Those who own aircraft still do not have a permanent safety mechanism for the purpose for which they are intended.

There are three future possibilities for the ELT's. Two of these possibilities involve new battery packs; lithium thionol chloride and lithium carbon monofluoride. There is another possibility which by 1982 we might be into, and that is when Canadians and Americans, working, perhaps not surprisingly, with the Russians who share a good part of the northern hemisphere with us, perfect a satellite which might be launched into a polar orbit. It would be the first search and rescue satellite. It would pass over every area in the northern hemisphere every four hours or less and could immediately pinpoint any downed aircraft and, of course, save many millions of dollars in air rescue costs. To be located, however, the ELT employed would require an entirely different structure from those we are familiar with now, and they would have to be vastly upgraded.

The first difficulty then with ELTs is the fact that one is dealing with three different departments: the Department of Communications, which governs the airwaves but frankly does not care too much about aircraft; the Department of Transport, which cares about aircraft but has no control over the airwaves; and, finally, the Department of National Defence, which is in charge of search and rescue.

The people who have really suffered in all of this, as I have tried to point out, are the aircraft owners. They never know what is coming next. They do not know when they will have to reach in their pockets and buy some new kind of hardware, and there is a good possibility that the next notice to airmen will tell them to rip out what they have just installed. Uppermost must be the safety factor. We never have any idea how many pilots have suffered injury or death because they did, or perhaps did not, have a lithium or non-lithium powered ELT.

Aeronautics Act

The second group to suffer are the manufacturers who try to accommodate the flying public and try to do what the department wants, but every time they get an inventory big enough to serve the requirements the regulations are changed and they are out a pile of money.

The interim solution that was published in a bulletin from the Minister of Transport announced on February 7 that the department, air administration, has approved a modification which will permit the reinstallation of ELTs in approximately 6,000 aircraft. This came out just last month, and all it amounted to was a waiver of the existing specifications. Frankly, it does not satisfy the users or the climatic conditions. The worst part of it is that five years ago, when pilots or aircraft owners were installing ELTs, they had to meet two kinds of specifications. Now we are back to doing it the old way.

The department, in my opinion, has been irresponsible to almost everyone affected. The Minister of Transport knows that to be issuing something like a schedule 3 now means that in a few years either improved lithium will be back or there may well be a satellite tuned ELT in operation. Therefore he is not doing his job properly.

After this, Mr. Speaker, you can see how we need an evaluation of the regulations, and need to ask questions and find out how many dollars could be saved by the use of ELTs. That would have been a pretty straightforward task for some of us involved in aviation.

I want to spend a few minutes more dealing with one other practice that was brought to my attention. This is a practice that goes on and it is my contention that the department is in an adversary position because of the sort of thing it does. This has reference to the user-pay fee as it was being considered to apply to instrument flight rules in Canada; that is, IFR flights in Canada.

The Manitoba Aviation Council wrote to the minister and was kind enough to give me a copy of the letter. I do not intend to quote directly from it in detail, but it made the very good point that if pilots were to attempt to upgrade themselves in their flying they would fly, as I have done many times, under instrument flight rules when it was not necessary. They would take flight procedures in the air that were not necessary but which help them to become more proficient in the flying of their aircraft. Surely this must be the approach, and is in the best interests of the Department of Transport.

What was intended by the department was that it would charge extra if I, for example, wanted to fly from here to my home under instrument flight rules. I would have to pay extra. Obviously I would not do that if I did not have to. As a consequence, my instrument flying would perhaps suffer. The department attempted to do this right across Canada. It was going to put this into operation in a way that would endanger the actual livelihood of fixed base operators.

Anyone in general aviation in Canada knows that if you are flying in Canada you are usually flying east to west, and you have a number of routes available to you. Certainly if you are flying through Canada, where there are charges being levied to