

EDITED HANSARD - March 2, 2007

Aviation Safety

[↙ ↘](#) [Table of Contents]

Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ): [↘](#)

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities indicated in this House, with regard to Mr. Moshansky's testimony on aviation safety, "This expert's testimony could not have been clearer. He said that the proposed system, the system that is now in place, will improve transportation safety".

How can the minister ignore the fact that this same expert said, on the contrary, that Bill C-6 will create the perfect conditions for other aviation tragedies?

[↙ ↘](#) [Table of Contents]

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): [↙ ↘](#)

Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I said yesterday in this House. The new system is an add-on, an umbrella, that provides more safety for those travelling in Canadian skies.

It is obviously in addition to the many inspectors already in place. Contrary to what the hon. member is saying, the number of inspectors has not decreased, but increased during this same period of time.

I understand that there are concerns about this, but I want to reassure my hon. colleague that we continue to be extremely vigilant in this matter.

[↙ ↘](#) [Table of Contents]

Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ): [↙ ↘](#)

Mr. Speaker, the minister can keep defending his safety system, but that does not change the fact that he is completely ignoring the recommendations of Mr. Moshansky on the need to have adequate human and financial resources as far as inspection is concerned.

Will he finally realize that a safety management system necessarily goes hand in hand with an effective inspection system, as strongly recommended by this expert?

Why is the minister so bent on eliminating the inspection system that is currently in place?

[↙ ↘](#) [Table of Contents]

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): [↙](#)

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to reassure my colleague that such is not the case. As for the proposals or comments by the expert who testified the day before yesterday, I refer him to the "blues". I will read the question my parliamentary secretary asked him:

[English]

"So if we would have had a safety management system that we're proposing today, plus the existing regulatory oversight, the incident at Dryden would not have taken place".

The answer is that it is very unlikely that it would have.

We are continuing with our program.

* * *