

*National Transportation Policy*

**Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario):** Mr. Speaker, some members in this House may realize that I have recently inherited an airport in my riding to be called the Pickering international airport, I presume. As this is directly related to transportation policy, I should like to say a few words which I hope the minister will take into consideration.

First of all, the airport proposal obviously has opponents and supporters and I am sure each one feels that he has pretty good reasons.

Those who oppose it do so because they feel that the need has not been established. Many feel that other transportation facilities could relieve the congestion that exists at Malton airport, that transportation problems can be solved through rapid transit systems and STOL aircraft to handle short flights, of less than 500 miles. They presently comprise approximately 50 per cent of the air traffic at Malton.

Many people feel that if this kind of thing were done and STOL aircraft were developed quickly, the need for the new airport would not exist. Other people oppose it on the basis of its close proximity to metropolitan Toronto and the fact that the proposed location would have an enormous impact upon the further urbanization of the Toronto region. We could end up with a *de facto* extension of Toronto to the Oshawa area.

All these people have a right to question the decisions being made by advisers to the Department of Transport and the bureaucrats. I am not saying that the department is wrong; I do not know. I do not have access to enough information to enable me to make a definitive statement in this regard. However, these people have a right to their reservations and a right to be heard. If this government is to live up to the expectations of participation that it has created, then I think we must take appropriate steps to see that these voices are heard.

When the new Expropriation Act was passed by this Parliament it was felt that a great step forward had been taken which would allow people about to be expropriated under federal jurisdiction to have a voice in the deliberations. Under the Expropriation Act, hearing officers are appointed. They are intended, in effect, to be the eyes and ears of the minister and to hear the complaints of those who would oppose a particular project. It is rather strange, however, that the hearing officer himself has no right to make any recommendation; all he can do is hear the complaints and report back to the minister. To many it would seem to be reasonable to expect that the Expropriation Act would give the hearing officer the right to make recommendations.

I suggest that the appropriate minister or indeed the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) in this particular case, ought to make it clear that he would have no objection to a hearing officer recommending what should take place. If he is not willing to do that, then I think this House should give consideration to amending section 8(4)(d) of the Expropriation Act. This section reads:

—within 30 days after his appointment, prepare and submit to the minister a report in writing on the nature and grounds of the objections made.

I think it would be reasonable—

**Mr. Benjamin:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Murta.]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. The hon. member is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Benjamin:** In light of the motion put forward by the official opposition on the National Transportation Act, would you please ask the hon. member why he is talking about the Expropriation Act?

**Mr. Cafik:** I would be delighted to answer that question. It is because the Expropriation Act in this case happens to be the vehicle that the Minister of Transport is using and I presume will use in future in order to acquire property for transportation purposes. It seems to me to be relevant.

**Mr. Benjamin:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are not discussing amendments to the Expropriation Act and the hon. member is completely out of order. If he wants to carry the ball for some land speculators, he can do it some other time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik).

**Mr. Cafik:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it would be reasonable to amend the act to add to that particular section—

**Mr. Benjamin:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, will you rule whether it is in order for the hon. member to talk about amendments to the Expropriation Act when we are debating the National Transportation Act?

**Mr. Basford:** You are out of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. The hon. member for Ontario.

**Mr. Cafik:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope that these interruptions will be deducted from the time allotted to me. I believe that kind of amendment would give an opportunity for more meaningful participation by people affected in the expropriation of properties for transportation purposes. I further believe that the same objective would be accomplished if we were to permit the hearing officer to allow cross-examination of witnesses in respect of the need, whether it be for airport sites or otherwise. People should have the right to cross-examine government witnesses and experts on whether a particular expropriation is required. This is not provided under the act at present and I think that the minister ought to make it perfectly clear that it is the intention to allow such cross-examination.

There are other things of genuine concern to people whose property is being expropriated for this or any other purpose, and I think they have a right to be heard and a right to participate. At the moment there is nothing in the act which indicates how many hearing officers would be appointed to deal with this type of problem. In a case of this magnitude I suspect that more than one would be required. I believe that the minister ought to appoint a senior hearing officer, who would be a judge, to deal with the over-all question. In addition, I think this is how our expropriation—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. I did not want to disturb the hon. member who has the