

*National Transportation Act, 1986*

reviewed by the Governor in Council, and that all those below these ceilings will be reviewed by the normal Investment Canada procedure. I believe that is something we should all fear.

I recently received a letter from and had interviews with people from CP Rail, a Mr. Richard Bell and a Mr. Jacques Côté they expressed very serious concerns about CP and CN. Given the time, I would simply say that the management feels we must send this Bill back because there is the potential for a loss of jobs and the loss of contracts to our own Canadian competition. The inevitable conclusion is that there will be very serious suffering for workers.

These workers feel that they are facing extremely unfair American competition. They feel that Bill C-18 would place the integrity of Canada's railway system at risk and that there is no provision in U.S. law that would similarly require American railways to expose their traffic to competition from Canada. We are looking at unfair competition from the American side. I hope we will give this Bill very serious consideration by sending it back to committee.

**Mr. Kilgour:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone) has raised a number of points. Her question about the disabled community is well worth answering. I actually worked on the committee which reviewed the human rights legislation a number of years ago.

**Mrs. Finestone:** One year, that's all. April 17.

**Mr. Kilgour:** It seems to me that we worked on it earlier as well. The simple answer is that when this measure is passed, it will be subject to human rights legislation. The disabled community will have all of the rights with respect to access and so on that have been built into the human rights legislation which I support fully, as does the Hon. Member. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) has an advisory group on the development of access standards, and these will, I hope, quickly become part of the human rights legislation which will be enforced in the Act.

Regarding the question of safety, Members of the Hon. Member's Party have quoted the Auditor General's report for 1985, noting that Transport Canada was unable to inspect 100 per cent of Canada's air carriers at least once a year. The Auditor General's observation was a fact, although he did not conclude that this was inadequate. One hundred per cent inspection remains a goal, but the primary concern today is to conduct more frequent and intensive inspections of high risk activities and carriers. The number of air carrier inspector positions has been increased by 31 per cent over 1984-85, and steps have been taken to improve the effectiveness of inspection staff.

Please remember, Mr. Speaker, that Transport Canada has 13,000 men and women working on safety every day of every year. The Department's expenditures in that area will be about \$1.2 billion this year. The highest priority is being given to

safety. The Hon. Member raised a number of other points but I think I should leave time for her if she wishes to reply.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker, I have a real deep and abiding concern over safety. It is not a partisan concern, because either the Hon. Member or I could be on an aircraft. A recent study indicates that we require a minimum of 300 new inspectors if we are to at least maintain a decent safety record. When will we see these 300 people hired to do a task that must be done?

I am pleased to hear that my colleague has been studying the issue of the handicapped. I am glad to know that there might be some consideration given to that. However, as the saying goes, I'm from Missouri—show me. I would like to know in what clause of the Bill are these provisions and what kind of measures are being taken. I do not simply want goodwill, I want to know where it is written.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ouellet:** First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congregate the Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone) for her excellent speech, especially that part which she developed about the Government's complete lack of a coherent policy for the Canadianization of the transportation industry. It is clear that the major transportation companies in Canada have traditionally always been Canadian. As a matter of fact, Canada has greatly progressed because of the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways, both having contributed to the tremendous development of our country. When we read this Bill and hear the interpretations and remarks from the officials of both these major companies, we realize that the legislation put forward by the Conservative Government could result in the breaking up of both these great Canadian companies.

Both CPR and CNR officials have publicly stated that they felt unfairly treated by this Bill from a Conservative Government. Well, I know that for lack of time at the end of her speech, the Hon. Member was prevented from telling us what she would have liked to say about the concerns expressed by the railway companies. I think it would be appropriate for her to reflect on these objections which I feel are entirely founded because if, on the one hand, the Government wants to allow major Canadian shippers to move their goods at a lower cost, it would be unfortunate, on the other hand, if this bill killed these transportation companies which move manufactured products in Canada. Because then the manufacturers themselves would be the losers on the long run. And above all is the real danger that big Canadian transport companies might fall into foreign hands. I believe the Hon. Member could shed more light on what is being done in the United States in that respect.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker, I must tell the Hon. Member that he is the expert. As far as I am concerned, I only read and listen closely to witnesses who come and see me at my office. I can assure you that there were many witnesses—they are deeply concerned about allowing Americans to enter Canada with whatever means of transportation. They are governed by