

### Supply

(a) The shortage of trained, experienced inspection staff and other personnel has seriously impacted on the Directorate's ability to effectively perform its mandated tasks; (b) The increase in certification workload under ERR, resulting from the need to service new and expanding air carriers, is affecting the Directorate's ability to effectively complete its ongoing inspection program, and thereby assure industry compliance with established legislation, regulations and standards;

We had these findings and again the concerns went virtually unnoticed. The revolving door at Transport Canada continued. Economics continued to win the battle, a losing battle, over providing sufficient financial resources to the most important, the priority mandate of Transport Canada, safety.

Let me take the House once more to the Moshansky report, that very comprehensive report, three volumes thick, to the findings at page 913 where the Justice states:

Based on the information before this Commission, the Aviation Regulation Directorate was not adequately prepared to perform its functions in the latter 1980s.

The warning flags raised early in the 1980s and repeatedly thereafter had seemingly negligible effect. The forecasts of safety assurance deficiencies were soundly based and progressively confirmed, yet there was no proper response by the senior management of Transport Canada in the form of urgent planning or action to meet the inevitable challenge.

I am going to proceed to the last one because my time is short.

Had the Transport Canada Aviation Regulation Directorate been in a position to discharge all of its responsibilities in an effective and timely manner, some of the factors that contributed to the Dryden accident may not have arisen.

What we are saying on this side of the House—and this is not a laughing matter, because all the signals were there—I say to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport: What we have been asking for years now is that the department get serious about providing the necessary resources to ensure safety.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, today could be 1985 or 1989 all over again. The warnings have been issued again. Now in 1992 continued warnings are being given. We do not want to hear again in five years' time those words that ring out by Justice Moshansky. This accident at Dryden did not happen by chance, but it was allowed to happen.

**Mr. Lee Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is important

to re-emphasize that what was deregulated in these economic regulatory reforms, was the economic burden on the industry. The safety regulations have remained in place and have been strengthened over time.

We do not do justice to Canadians and the industry if we do not strongly say that today air travel in Canada is safer than it was 10 years ago. Transportation Safety Board statistics back this up.

The hon. member has made exhaustive reference to the Moshansky report. In a recent television interview, Justice Moshansky was asked: Is it safe to fly in Canada?

The author, the leader of the inquiry, Mr. Justice Moshansky replied on *Canada AM*: "Yes, I think it is safe to fly in Canada. I think we have one of the safest transportation systems in the world. That is not to say it is perfect. The thrust of my report was to identify deficiencies which should be corrected in order to bring it closer to perfection".

The Transportation Safety Board estimates that its accident rate since 1988 has been slightly below the average of the immediate preceding years. The most important thing for Canadians today is that we have not been standing still and waiting for this report.

Again as Mr. Justice Moshansky said: "I agree that the Canadian skies are safe. We have one of the safest aviation systems in the world, however, that is not to say it is perfect. We must also remember that this investigation was regarding an accident at a particular point in time. Certainly some positive steps have been taken by the department to correct a lot of the deficiencies which we discovered during the inquiry," he went on.

The member for Hamilton prefers to fearmonger and pretend that the government does not adequately respond to safety concerns. Our response clearly indicates our positive approach.

I want to ask the member this question. Does this mean that he has not taken the time to read our 93-page initial response to the Moshansky report which was tabled in this House and which indicates, as the minister has repeatedly said, that we have already acted on 49 per cent of Justice Moshansky's recommendations?

Is it possible that the member does not want to talk about a response precisely because it does show just how much we have done?