

*Aeronautics Act*

Bill C-85, Bill C-33, Bill C-109, Bill C-226, and now it is Bill C-220.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** History moves on.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Surely in an area as important as safety and the concern of getting to the bottom of accidents which take lives of individuals, a step in this direction is long overdue. Surely it is high time the government took the initiative and enacted this very important principle. I am sure the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East would not mind if the government stole his idea and brought it forth in the form of government legislation. He would be happy if the government would accept his particular bill and enshrine it into law. It is a good bill which has a broad base of support, not only in the industry but in many of the regulatory agencies as well.

There is no branch of the Department of Transport or any other federal agency which has over-all responsibility for ensuring that a systematic, comprehensive, and high standard of investigation is under way. It is important to ensure that safety is practised at all times and, when there is an error, that we get to the bottom of it so that we can avoid future catastrophes.

At page 9 of the bill, Clause 6 sets out to impose terms and conditions on a licence which is already issued. There is some concern here, because unilaterally the commission can change the licence by imposing restrictions, and new terms and conditions on licences which come up for renewal. While there may be some degree of necessity in this regard, it is important to ensure that there is proper access to appeals for those who have licences and find their licences restricted or almost withdrawn, as a result of the restrictions and the regulations added thereto.

At page 10, Clause 7 deals with the licensing of commercial air service. The thing which bothers us on this side of the House is the fact that we have no third level air carrier policy in this country and we have no clearly stated regional air policy. In June, 1975, the former minister of transport said that a regional and third level carrier policy would be forthcoming soon. There has been no mention of this fact ever since. We are asking the Canadian Transport Commission to deal on an ad hoc basis without any set government policy in terms of a third level air carrier policy. When you tie that in with the thrust of Bill C-33, under which the minister is emasculating and abrogating many of the powers in the hands of the CTC, probably the consequence will be that the licensing of these air carriers will be done more on the basis of political considerations, rather than the realities of economics, geography, and need. We should be pressing for a clear definition and statement of regional and third level carrier policy so that it can be meshed into the regulations which are enshrined within this piece of legislation.

● (1140)

It is clear the bill requires a great deal of clarification. It is important that it go to committee and that witnesses be heard. Amendments to some clauses will probably be required with a

[Mr. Mazankowski.]

view to clarifying the major thrusts of the intended legislation. I hope we can count upon the minister to ensure that there will be an opportunity to deal with witnesses and carry out a thorough, full-scale hearing into the many facets of the bill. In effect, we have been asked to deal with omnibus legislation and we should look at it in that light.

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** I do not want to take very long, Mr. Speaker, but I am interested in some of the comments the previous speaker made, particularly those concerning the new powers being sought by the minister as they would likely affect regional carriers. The suggestion was made that the minister would, in effect, be taking over the powers of the CTC.

I have been watching with some interest applications which have been made to the CTC by these second-line carriers—I use that term to distinguish them from CPA and Air Canada which might be considered first-line carriers. Some time ago I attended hearings which were held in Sudbury concerning an application by Nordair, which had offered a return flight daily from Montreal to Winnipeg via Sudbury and Thunder Bay. I was interested at that time to find that the minister of the day involved himself in those hearings, though in absentia, by sending a letter indicating that no matter what was decided he would not allow the Nordair aircraft to land at some of the airports scheduled because they were not capable of handling the Boeing 737. Apparently it was O.K. for a DC-9 to land there, though everyone knows there is only a difference of a few hundred pounds between the Boeing 737 and the DC-9.

I mentioned to the chairman of the CTC, who had been a colleague of mine in this House for a number of years, that there really wasn't any point in continuing the hearing, the minister having made a decision that the aircraft would not be allowed to land. What would be the sense of discussing whether Nordair should be given the opportunity to service the area or not? The whole exercise seemed foolish. I twitted the chairman of the commission about the matter. The intervention was clumsy, it seemed to me, because those responsible did not even bother to clear it with the district offices. The manager at Sudbury telephoned the district office in Toronto responsible for the safety and conditions of the runways in Sudbury, and the officials there informed him that the Sudbury runway could, of course, carry the Boeing 737. There had been no structural damage and it was not anticipated there would be.

It is interesting to remember, of course, that Air Canada was the operator intervening in that case. However, Air Canada only operated the flights for two months; it has since dropped the service, so the people of Montreal, Sudbury, Thunder Bay and Winnipeg are not able to take advantage of that run. The route is now directed through Toronto rather than through the northern part of the province, passing through Ottawa.

This tells me that if the minister cares to use the power he possesses over the licensing of airports it is he, really, who is able to control the entire operations of the air industry. He