

Edmonton for a long time. He knows the area, he knows the circumstances, and I am sure will lead us to consider with sympathy any of the points that are brought up.

Mr. MACDONALD: Just one further question at the moment. These zoning regulations are going to also embody the Namao base? They apply there too?

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, I think gradually we may have to apply them there. The intention is first of all to apply them to the main transcontinental airports and, of course, the main military airports.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would you consider Namao a main military airport?

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes.

Mr. MURRAY: Would the minister say that the Edmonton airport was unsafe?

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: Oh, I would not say that.

Mr. MURRAY: For 'planes to land on? Or is it likely to be?

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: No, I would not say that.

Mr. MURRAY: It is one of the best in the whole country?

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: It is an excellent airport.

Mr. MURRAY: A great international airport where they take off for Asia, the United States, and elsewhere. Surely it would not be a very expensive business to impose the regulations on that air field?

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: We do not think it would be, but as I indicated in the House each airport has to be considered by itself, and it may be that the application of these three restrictions to certain airports will mean no expenditure of funds at all. It is pretty difficult to ascertain until an examination has been made. We have dealt with two or three major airports but we have not gone over all airports to which we think these regulations or restrictions should apply.

Mr. MOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a step in the right direction. However, there is one thing I do not understand here in regard to this bill. We are just speaking of airports on land. Now, would this have anything to do with zoning on water? There are places where we have seaplanes landing and the hazards there have been terrific. People have been able to put up more hazards in the way and yet there is no zoning mentioned here for seaplanes.

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, an airport as I understand it includes a seaport for aircraft but the zoning would hardly apply to a seaport unless there were buildings within the 150 foot limit I referred to earlier. In so far as the approaches to the base are concerned there would be no contravention I would think, or I cannot imagine any contravention of the regulations in so far as they concern the flight ways and the sides of the airways.

Mr. MOTT: The point I am coming to is this, and I have had some experience with something similar. On the Fraser river we were trying to keep a certain section clear more or less for a private landing. When they had the big Cansos landing on the river all of a sudden the power company came along and put lines across. We found that we could not stop them because there was no zoning. They just put the power lines across and they cut out any seaplane landing there at all. That has happened and there is nothing in this bill that would correct it.

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: Perhaps we could have counsel give evidence on that or Mr. Baldwin. I am informed it is covered by the bill.

Mr. GREEN: Could we have a general statement?

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: I think Mr. Baldwin would do that.