

government responsible for the decision and the prosecution. By that, he meant the government of Ontario. I do not deny that the government of Ontario has responsibility with respect to some compensatory arrangement in a case where an accused has been exonerated. However, I do believe the Solicitor General ought not to slide away from his responsibility on that basis.

Given the fact that this matter has been previously discussed as a matter of principle at the federal level, and the inadequacy of the system has been touched upon at the federal level, is the Solicitor General prepared to take an extraordinary responsibility and get in touch with the Attorney General of Ontario concerning this case, knowing that he will be joined by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings, by me, and by several other Members of Parliament from Ontario who are anxious that there be some justice done in this case, particularly when it appears that the charge should never have been laid in the first place?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General): Madam Speaker, I have been able to ascertain that there is no precedent my officials have been able to find for such compensatory action at the federal level.

Miss MacDonald: Establish one then.

Mr. Kaplan: I am having a search done, although it is more difficult, to find provincial precedents for doing so in any of the provinces of Canada.

Mr. Beatty: Tell us about compassion.

Mr. Kaplan: However, I will note the hon. member's representation and I will bring it to the attention of my colleague, the Attorney General of Canada.

LAW REFORM COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, perhaps when the minister does that, he could bring to the minister's attention the 1973 study of the federal Law Reform Commission on Criminal Court costs where the existing system is described as being totally inadequate and which should be replaced by a full cost system. The recommendations in that study went on to suggest that perhaps federal-provincial arrangements might be made, and for that kind of thing to be provided. That is what I meant when I said there has been a discussion in principle by the federal government on this inadequacy. Given that, will the Solicitor General go a little further and not only discuss the matter of compensation with his colleagues but join with others in this House of Commons, especially in view of the fact that in this case an injustice has been perpetrated, and go to the government of Ontario to ask it to move on its position in the hope also that the Government of Canada will see its way clear to do justice in this case?

Oral Questions

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General): Madam Speaker, I note the hon. member's point. I will bring it to my colleague's attention.

* * *

● (1150)

AIRPORTS

COSTS OF DORVAL TO MIRABEL REMOVAL

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Transport. With respect to his calculations on the Dorval-Mirabel operations, I would ask the minister if he has had provided to him a cost-benefit study with respect to the cost to Montreal of the removal of certain airlines from Dorval to Mirabel?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, this has been thoroughly researched. A first study has already been made public, and a second will be made public at the same time as the cabinet decision is announced.

My hon. friend should know, and does know because he is a very sophisticated economist, that there are many ways of presenting these costs. For example, one of the airlines has put in as a cost a new airplane, because of the extra distance that this move to Mirabel would represent. The same airline forgot to reduce the 17 miles from trips going west that this would also bring about.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Seventeen miles?

Mr. Pepin: This is not news; there are many ways to present costs. There is a saying that if you put ten economists in a room you will have 15 answers, and this applies in this particular case also. To calculate the costing to passengers, airlines, to government and so on is a very uncertain exercise.

POSITION OF AIRLINES

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): The one element I am sure the minister has not taken into account is the possibility of not spending that money on that operation, and instead installing radar at Victoria International Airport. I would ask the Minister of Transport whether he has taken that into consideration. At the same time, would he tell us which airlines have actually petitioned him to move from Dorval to Mirabel to get on the back of that elephant?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, the answer to the second question is none.

The answer to the first question is to observe my hon. friend's total lack of gratitude because I have already informed him that in the RAMP program, the radar development program, Victoria is first on the list. I already told him that. I expected compliments, regards and gratitude, but obviously I am not getting anything!