

Aeronautics Act

expense have established facilities so they would not have to fly long hauls of 500 and 600 miles with nothing whatsoever to aid them in navigating from point to point.

It would be outside the scope of this bill but I could discuss a good many gaps in the encouragement of general aviation in the north. I shall not do so. But it is certainly reasonable to expect the department to look a little more enlighteningly at the question of general aviation across the country and the atrocious charges that are made in the way of landing fees and hangar rentals. Here I perhaps have another vested interest, but I am not going to bring the matter to the point of a vote or anything like that. However, it is pertinent to point out that the charge of \$17 a month for parking a light aircraft outside in the winter is just outlandish. To move that light aircraft into an unheated hangar costs the user on the average between \$50 and \$60 a month. That is the charge just to use hangar space which is not even heated. This is absolutely ridiculous. You are not going to encourage people to own and fly aircraft, which I suggest is a desirable thing in this country, a pioneer in the aviation field, with this kind of approach. I believe it is time that the personnel in the department took a second look at this question. We all know that these bills are not the brainchild of the minister, whoever may be holding the transport portfolio. These bills are the brainchild of the Department of Transport itself.

• (4:20 p.m.)

So, Mr. Speaker, through the minister I should like to make this plea on behalf of general aviation in Canada because the bill does touch on charges to the user of facilities and services provided by the Department of Transport. I am not going to propose any amendments at this stage; I cannot in any event. But I would suggest to the minister that one which should be made is that the word "availability" in the proposed section 3A (1) (b) should be deleted and that the word "user" should be substituted in place thereof.

Mr. Heward Graffey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, in opening the discussion on second reading the minister mentioned the fact that many of the regulations under debate relate specifically to safety. In my brief remarks this afternoon I want to address my words to the question of safety regulations.

Mr. Turner: Safety in the air.

Mr. Graffey: Safety in the air. While I think that most aeronautical experts will agree that the situation is not perfect at the present time and that there is much progress to be made, I think most Canadians and most citizens of the United States of America owe a great vote of gratitude to the air industry with respect to safety measures. The record of the air industry in relation to safety has been truly little short of magnificent, even though I have already stated, Mr. Speaker, that there is much progress which can be made.

For example, what has happened in the United States during the year 1965? If I put some statistics before the house this afternoon we need only divide them by ten to ascertain the situation in Canada. While 55,000 people died on the highways of the United States in 1965 only 1,000 people died during the course of commercial airline flights. I think I am correct in stating that actually more millions of man miles were flown in the air than millions of man miles were driven on the highways. If we divide those figures by ten, then generally speaking we have the Canadian situation.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that this afternoon the minister is able to discuss in the house some pretty sophisticated safety regulations both with regard to navigation—

Mr. Turner: It is a question of jurisdiction. We have primary jurisdiction.

Mr. Graffey: Yes, that is right. That is a good point and I was going to get down to it. I am putting the question rhetorically, as the minister will see.

Why is it that we can discuss sophisticated regulations at the present time? Why do we have very good safety regulations for aircraft today? It is simply because millions and millions and millions of dollars have been spent on safety research regarding air navigation and aircraft. In fact, the department for which the minister is speaking this afternoon very kindly furnished me with a memorandum in the last week or two which sets out the federal control over the production of ships, aircraft and rolling stock on the railways with specific relation to safety measures.

We find in the Aeronautics Act—frankly, Mr. Speaker, I may be getting away from the specific act now but the minister can put me straight—which is administered by the Department of Transport that aircraft are licensed only if they reach certain standards of