

He did not acknowledge that the customer becomes the king. The consumer decides how many airplanes should fly, how many trains should go back and forth as opposed to imposing this at the expense of taxpayers and the state of the economy of this country.

I want to get to the specifics of what he talked about. He made a statement that deregulation reduced services and made air traffic less safe.

If that is the statement of the opposition today, let the hon. gentleman stand in his place and tell this House what safety regulations were taken away or were reduced by the Department of Transport. What specific safety regulations were ended because of deregulation? Let him be specific. Which specific safety regulations do we not have today that we had before we went into this deregulation?

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question. It shows the underlying lack of knowledge of the government as to the impact of deregulation.

Let me deal with his last question in a very direct way. There were no safety regulations that were changed as a result of deregulation. There is no question about that.

As to what was not done, as far back as the spring of 1984 the departmental staff were warning that they did not have sufficient inspectors to ensure that as we moved into a deregulated environment we would be able to make sure that it remained safe. That is point number one.

With respect to point number two, I will repeat what I said in my speech. When you take away the economic stability of a carrier and that carrier begins to look for ways in which to cut corners, then instead of an extra margin of safety that it would operate under—in other words, replacing a part at 800 hours instead of the prescribed 1,000 hours—the margin of safety was reduced. There was no violation of the law, let us make that clear. But it created a culture that left open the possibility of a Dryden crash which regretfully happened.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan, who talked about trucking. I have an article from March 1992 written by Jean-Roch Savard which says: “On December 6, 1991, the Government of Canada announced a series

Supply

of measures concerning the transportation industry, especially trucking. These provisions should in principle improve the tax system for carriers and subcontractors. By taking advantage of these measures, highway transportation companies should become more competitive, it is thought”. He concludes his article by saying: “In my opinion, only a concerted effort of the federal and provincial governments will get the trucking industry back in shape. Ottawa has shown its goodwill. Given the present political context, Quebec must get the message and do its part”.

Will Ontario now do its part to help the trucking industry in southern Ontario?

[*English*]

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I welcome my colleague's question. First of all, let me say that I welcomed the federal initiative. It was a good short-term solution to a long-term problem. But it would not have been necessary had we not allowed the proliferation of truckers to exceed the ability of the suppliers to provide goods to move. That is the reality.

In terms of Ontario, I do not have the specifics with me. Ontario did participate with the federal government in trying to find solutions to the situation as it related to Ontario. It is working on it. It has made some announcements. I am not sure if they parallel those of Quebec.

Certainly, we all recognize that truckers are in deep trouble. Not just the independents but the whole system is in trouble because of the competition from the United States. If we let the NAFTA agreement go through, assuming that the draft that I read into the record in this House is accurate, giving them full access to trucking, then we might as well kiss all of our independent operators goodbye.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Mr. Speaker, I quite appreciated the speech by my hon. colleague that pointed out to some degree the inevitable impact of deregulation and the difference in philosophy. It is clear there is a difference in philosophy between this side and the other side.

I want to ask a question about the government acting within the context of its own ideology, within the context of the American experience in this House during the debate.