

we do have a full fledged service between Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal using the Dash-7, this will encourage foreign buyers.

The Dash-7 is a very good plane. I understand it has some energy limitations and it is quite expensive, but it is good for use in the maritimes, in the rural communities, or in the outports in Newfoundland. It could be used, I am sure, on the west coast of B.C., and could perhaps help to phase out some of the high costs of operating a ferry service on the west coast. The Twin Otter is used by Nordair in northern Ontario, and I understand the province of Ontario wants to set up another service in northwestern Ontario. This is how the Dash-7 and the Twin Otter can best be used. They should not be used for commuter type service from a city downtown to another city downtown, because if the STOL service between Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal is allowed to operate from the Toronto Island airport, it will cut into the potential patronage of the rail services, this at a time when, as I have explained, the government is trying to upgrade passenger rail services in the corridor.

As far as I am concerned, a businessman travelling between Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal—his ticket is always paid by expense account—should have no option. He should just be able to go to the international airport and take the conventional jet service and pay for that privilege. I do not particularly want to make it easier for businessmen to travel between Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal if it means that we will take away a potential source of revenue for railways, because rail does not serve the businessman on a business account, it serves the ordinary wage earner, the person who cannot afford to travel by plane between Montreal and Toronto.

The train is very versatile. You can have one coach with a dining car facility with all manner of food and beverage service for which the businessman can pay, and you can have the coach and other forms of accommodation which are considerably cheaper. Therefore rail is a much more popular mode of transit.

Secondly, and this is a more parochial issue because I represent a constituency in the east end of Toronto, if the STOL service is to operate out of the island airport we will not be bothered too much by the noise. I am sure the two constituencies to the south represented by members of the New Democratic Party would have more noise from an increase in the traffic flow to the Toronto Island airport. What concerns me is that, representing as I do a constituency which is not a particularly wealthy one, the average working men and women cannot afford to travel outside of the city by car or bus to cottages but seek their recreation on Toronto Island.

Anyone in the House who knows Toronto very well knows that Toronto Island parks have become very crowded over the past few years, and to increase air traffic at the island airport would mean the building of parking facilities and a bridge over the western gap. A bridge under it would be difficult to build since boats use the principal channel. It would mean also the development of a great infrastructure for the island airport. This would destroy the recreational component of Toronto Island which is so dear to the people of metropolitan Toronto.

Transportation Policies

I can see that my colleague, the hon. member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Douglas), who is a great proponent of STOL service, does not agree with my sentiments. I do not disagree with regional STOL services operating out of the island airport to small points such as Bruce County, Parry Sound or Peterborough, using Twin Otters, but what I do object to is a mass movement of people by Dash-7, which seats 50 passengers, between the major cities because I see that this is merely an attempt by government officials—I say government officials because I want to draw the distinction between government officials and ministers who, I am not sure, are fully aware of the implications of the development of a STOL service on the Toronto Island—of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Transport to bail themselves out of the difficulties, such as the whole question arising out of the expansion of the Toronto International Airport at Malton.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: No.

● (1750)

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, with only ten minutes left I am afraid I had to deny the hon. member more time. The hon. member for York East (Mr. Collenette) suggested that nobody from the government side in the Transport Committee was willing to oppose the user pay concept. Had he been in his seat at the time the statement was made he would have heard it loud and clear, and I submit that the silence of other Liberal members on that committee at that moment, and the applause of other members from the House of Commons, gave assent to the statement that they did not support the user pay concept, so the caucus opposite is somewhat divided. The hon. member should not have accused the hon. gentleman from Selkirk as he did.

The hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) covered a great deal of the ground I wanted to cover. Time prohibits me from covering all the ground I would like to cover, but I commend that speech to the minister. I ask him to read it because therein lies the fault Canadians are finding with the transportation structure of Canada. Individual lines are not serviced, roads are not good enough, air service is regulated to a degree which is ridiculous in certain areas, and that is also the case in the Atlantic area. I submit that if the transport system in the Atlantic area had been as good as the minister implied in his remarks, then the Transport Committee of the House of Commons would have flown by public carrier and would not have used a government plane to take its members from place to place. With the existing air schedules in Atlantic Canada, had they resorted to public carriers, they would have spent their time in airplanes and airports, and would have had little time to consider the interests of the public in the transportation field.

The minister referred to Bill C-33. If I am not mistaken, it was introduced on March 1, and when it was introduced the