

changes are needed so as to maximize Air Canada's maintenance operations and minimize safety risks. To my knowledge, no heed has been paid to the suggestions of these inspectors. Why? Because Air Canada investigates itself. It is called conflict of interest.

With regard to specific safety dangers and accidents relating to Air Canada at Dorval, I can discuss many, but a few will suffice. Most recently there was the serious incident on March 26 involving flight 526 from Quebec City. While climbing at 14,000 feet this DC-9 aircraft lost cabin pressure. Only 40 per cent of the oxygen masks on board were operational. This is absolutely inexcusable. Fortunately the aircraft landed with no injuries to the passengers on board. It turns out that this plane was only 26 hours off its "A" check. Air Canada conducts its layover checks at Dorval after a plane has flown some 50 hours. So what went wrong? Unfortunately, we will never know. However, with an independent commission investigating such incidents and reporting to parliament, the public would know.

● (1740)

As things are now, the public is misled by Air Canada on incidents concerning safety. After I brought this matter up in the House, the freshman president of the air line, Ralph Vaughn, had the gall to deny that the just mentioned incident ever occurred. He actually said, and I quote:

We have found that these charges have no basis in fact and it is unfortunate that Mr. McKenzie continues to make these allegations.

However, these are not my allegations. Rather they are the facts as stated in the daily aircraft performance summary sheet issued by the maintenance branch at Dorval. Also the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) admitted in committee that there was an oxygen problem on flight 526. So there is a conflict between the minister and Mr. Vaughn.

Another incident involving Air Canada safety which was hushed up by the air line concerns their L-1011 aircraft, a jet which has been, according to Air Canada, performing far below the goals set by the manufacturer. On May 19, 1973, Air Canada flight TO20 was forced into an emergency landing after a fire on board. Upon investigation it was discovered that the number one engine had two boroscoping ports open and that the fire was caused by hot gases blowing on to the engine fire wire from the open boroscoping ports. Fortunately once again there was no major accident or injuries, but think of what could have happened, Mr. Speaker. Your guess is as good as mine concerning what Air Canada and the government have done to prevent such an incident from happening again.

Then there are the incidents concerning five Air Canada flights which occurred between January 24 and February 22 of last year. Flights 296, 634, 625, 238 and 280 flying on January 24, February 13, February 15, February 19 and February 22 all did so at tremendous risk to their passengers. A March 22, 1973 daily aircraft performance summary issued by the Dorval maintenance branch stated that in all cases the engine push/pull control cables, with the exception of aircraft number 709, were in various states of distress ranging from moisture in assembly and lack of

Transport Commission of Inquiry

lubrication on the cables to worn cables and deterioration of teflon linings in the conduits. The summary also said that these things went unnoticed "as a result of a breakdown in the routine C-3 maintenance check." This in turn was due to the fact that job tickets were not issued for the work. Why? Nobody knows except perhaps Air Canada.

These, then, are but a few examples involving Air Canada and safety at Dorval. Incidents of this nature seem to occur now daily on our public air line and I am quite sure similar things happen to and on our other transportation modes. We simply must have some sort of federal commission to investigate these and other incidents, whether it be Air Canada, CP Air or another air line that is involved, and whether it be an air, rail, ground or water transportation accident or incident.

Mr. Charles Turner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Bill C-109 as set out in the explanatory note is to establish a permanent and impartial commission of inquiry to investigate transport accidents that are within federal jurisdiction. The explanatory note further suggests that under present laws many transport accidents, sometimes resulting in loss of life, are investigated by the federal body that is responsible for making and enforcing the rules under which the transport operated when the accident occurred. It is suggested that there is an obvious conflict of interest in such cases. It seems to me that the statement contained in the explanatory note setting out the reasons for the introduction of this bill could stand some analysis.

It is true that in the case of railway accidents, as an example, a good deal of the regulation of the railways is done by the railway transport committee of the Canadian Transport Commission. The same commission normally investigates railway accidents and attempts to determine their cause. It may be an over-simplification, however, to suggest that because an entity regulates a mode of transportation it is in a conflict of interest position when it investigates an accident involving that mode.

It can be argued, I think with a considerable degree of justification, that the regulatory agency needs to conduct accident investigations to determine what changes in its regulations may be necessary or desirable in the interests of safety. Although the personnel involved in this type of responsibility are human like everyone else, it is probably safe to say that they are dedicated to the objective of insuring that the mode of transportation for which they are responsible is as efficient and, in addition, as safe as human ingenuity can be expected to provide. In an area in which it is very difficult for anyone to maintain any degree of secrecy, it appears highly unlikely that the railway transport committee could, even if it so desired, hide from the public's knowledge the fact that a railway accident resulted from some deficiency in the railway transport committee's regulation of the railway industry.

In the case of other modes of transportation, for example the air mode, the regulatory agency is organized in such a way that there is no responsibility, direct or indirect, of the air investigation branch to the portion of the air administration which is responsible for the act of regulation of the air industry. In fact, the accident investigation branch and the regulatory portion of the administration are independent from each other and independently report