

*National Transportation Act, 1986*

have to remember that it is not really that far by boat since these cities are right across the lake from each other.

I would like to ask a question to my colleague for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart). He spoke about safety earlier and I think that this is an extremely important issue. The Canadian Air Line Pilots' Association has said that safety is mentioned only in passing in the document *Freedom to Move* and it is simply stated that economic regulatory reform will not be allowed to interfere with safety standards.

For my part, I believe that, in view of all that is happening in the area of transport and the difficulty some companies may have in keeping up the maintenance of all their transport equipment, whether we are speaking about truckers, airlines or railways, if there are no controls or special mechanisms to urge the contractors to apply safety standards, we could have serious problems very quickly and this could lead to serious accidents. I would like to know whether my colleague for Montreal—Sainte-Marie shares my views on the issue of safety.

**Mr. Malépart:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the financial aspect is important, but you cannot set a price on the safety of passengers and Canadians generally. I believe that you cannot set a price on human life or on health, and that there should be no competition for markets in this regard. That is quite clear. The Hon. Member referred to experts in this field who have said that this is not covered by the Bill in its present form or by the consultations which have taken place. This is not a statement by a Member of Parliament with no experience or knowledge in this area, but a statement by experts. I would like to give an example to my colleague. In the field of airport security, we all remember that there was some cheap labour, that is people paid less than elsewhere, at Dorval and Mirabel. We recall what were the results of this situation when there was a strike. What happened? It was proven that there was absolutely no security, that the people there were not trained because they were cheap labour. A company had simply hired someone who had not been given any training.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen what can happen and we now have to regulate the transport of toxic materials. Why is it that, when human beings are involved, we say: It is not serious, let us go ahead, let us deregulate, nothing will happen, we shall deal with the problems later. I think that my colleague is right to raise this basic point. In my opinion, all Parliamentarians should consider that if deregulation jeopardizes or threatens the safety of Canadians, that is enough to justify automatic rejection of this Bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I shall recognize first the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway), and then the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Kilgour).

• (1630)

[English]

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, when I saw the Hon. Member rising to his feet to speak, my ears perked up. While I know that on occasion he likes to take off on flights of fancy and sometimes his facts do not quite add up, I thought maybe this time he would redeem himself. I thought perhaps we would finally hear a well-reasoned and logical speech. After all, he does profess to speak for ordinary Canadians like me and you. However, as he started to speak I heard him say that when deregulation of the airlines had taken place in the U.S. there had been a loss of jobs. You and I are well aware, Mr. Speaker, that when deregulation took place in the U.S. between 1980 and 1985, a time in which a very serious recession took place, indeed it was called the Great Recession, jobs were not lost in the airline industry. There was in fact an increase in employment of some 9 per cent. So right away the Hon. Member started to lose me in his comments.

Then he went on to say that deregulation was the law of the jungle and apparently he did not support it. That brought me back to thinking about the fact that he sat here as a member of the former Liberal Government which started the ball rolling on deregulation of air transportation. Now he stands up here and tells us that he did not support it. We did not hear that at the time. I do not remember his getting up and shaking his fist at his Minister of Transport and stomping out of the Chamber or voting against it and calling it the law of the jungle.

I wonder if the Hon. Member would like to tell us why at the time his Government introduced the first step towards deregulation of transportation he did not make the same sort of speech in the House that he just did. If we look back in *Hansard* I do not think we will find him making a speech on that subject at all, and very few on anything else.

• (1640)

[Translation]

**Mr. Malépart:** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we cannot regulate intelligence. The Hon. Member who just spoke did not understand my opening remarks. This is sad, and the best proof is the comment made by a "deregulated" man. Mr. Speaker, this is something. At first, I said: the Liberal Party does not oppose some deregulation; the Liberal Party, and my colleague for Papineau is right in opposing that, and the Hon. Member, if he wants to be honest when talking about creating 9 per cent jobs in the United States, can tell us where all those employees of *People's Express* are. The Hon. Member forgot to say, if he wants to be honest, that in most competing airlines, employees were forced to accept salary cuts. So the Hon. Member refers to job creation. Speaking as a true Tory, where there is a \$15,000 job he says: This fellow earns too much, we are going to cut his salary in half. You will get \$7,000, and the other fellow, we will give him \$8,000. That is Tory policy.