

*Pickering Airport*

oriented, as so much concerning a second airport in Toronto has been politically oriented by this government.

Let us get the record clear. When the first announcement was made concerning the proposal to build at Pickering, our party spokesman at that time made it clear that we did not believe a second airport should be built. We suggested a preferable approach would be to build an airport in the Kingston area which would service the Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa areas. We suggested that rapid transit facilities could be built between the central airport in the Kingston area and the three cities I have just mentioned. As well as a high speed transit service for the airport, the service would have been of inestimable value to the residents of the three cities with regard to their commuting problems. That was our position at that time.

I will be very interested in hearing the spokesman for the New Democratic Party. If you read *Hansard* for March 2, 1972, you will see that the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) was almost bubbling over in his commendation of the Jamieson proposal announced that day. He concluded with the following words:

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by congratulating the minister on his decision; I think it was a wise one.

That was his attitude on March 2, 1972, concerning the announced Pickering airport. We believe it was not a wise decision. We believe that the minister's suggestion today that he will have only some kind of mini-airport with a mini-runway is not being frank with the Canadian public. The minister made it clear that he believes international air service should be routed through Pickering. He referred to the Gibson report in certain respects, but not to the comment on page 212 of the report which states that all international travel should be routed through Pickering. These are the words used:

The noisiest aircraft presently operating at Malton, the DC-8 and the 707, which are used in the international sector, will fly from the proposed Pickering airport.

I believe it is important that that be on the record. This airport is being designed to carry the noisiest aircraft presently in service. In referring to the Gibson report, we should bear in mind that that report substantially accepted and endorsed the Ministry of Transport's projections with regard to air travel in the Toronto area. We suggest those statistics are already outdated. They are based on the years 1973, 1972 or earlier.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald), who is in the chamber, knows the impact which the energy crisis has had on air travel. There is serious doubt whether projections based on those statistics are reliable when projecting future air travel. That is why we suggested to the minister that rather than making the hasty decision he has given today he defer his decision for two, three or possibly five years to avoid an unfortunate mistake such as I believe he has made.

We suggest this because already 1974 figures for air travel indicate there has been a slackening in world air passenger travel increases. A recent ICAO news release is headlined "World airline traffic in 1974 shows smallest increase in 15 years". It points out that the year's rate of growth for total traffic was the lowest since 1958. They also point out that 1974 was the first year in which the

airline industry showed a decline in aircraft miles flown. Is it not reckless for the government, knowing that this entire sector of transportation is changing, to rush in with today's hasty statement? They say they intend to go ahead with Pickering with one runway. This somehow is to pacify those in the area surrounding Pickering, and at the same time the government is hoping to pacify the Malton residents.

We have made it clear that we believe there is no need for those in the Malton area to be subjected to rising noise levels as a result of air traffic activity. We stick to that assertion. We believe that there are already possible alternative means of transportation that could handle much of the air traffic increase now projected to go through Malton. I refer to rapid transit between such points as Montreal and Toronto, or the development of a STOL Airport at the Island airport. There are many other technologically possible alternatives than simply stating that we need a second airport for Toronto and it should be at Pickering.

● (1720)

I should like to turn now to the lot of those people who live close to the Pickering airport site. In his statement the minister made it clear that the Gibson report points out that certain communities adjacent to the Pickering site may have a noise problem. He says that he is sympathetic to the residents of Claremont and hopes that some arrangement can be made to buy their properties. I take it that the residents of Stouffville will just have to live with the noise in spite of the fact that the Gibson report recommended that some effort should be made to reach an accommodation with them. The minister says that he does not believe they are going to be bothered by the noise and his department does not intend to offer any compensation to them. He also said that he intends to consult municipal and provincial governments. I was glad to hear that. I would point out, however, that up to the present he has not consulted municipal governments in the Pickering area nor the municipal government in Stouffville.

At page 75 of the report of the airport inquiry commission the following statement appears:

The commission is of the opinion, having heard all the evidence, that the 28 NEF contour comes too close to Claremont and too close to Stouffville and if the Pickering airport is to be developed that the lands embracing both of these communities should be acquired.

At page 76 of the report the following appears:

It is the commission's view that the project should include, as a minimum, the expropriation of all land within the 25 NEF zone level, or greater, in addition to that which it has commented upon concerning Claremont and Stouffville.

Hon. members should note that according to the document just tabled, the minister does not accept the recommendations of the Gibson report concerning the residents of Stouffville. This is most unfortunate. The government has purchased 18,000 acres in the Pickering area and has frozen about 60,000 acres, without compensation. For the Mirabel airport, however, the government bought over 80,000 acres outright. In Ontario they have just purchased the 18,000 acres and frozen the land surrounding the area. The Gibson report said, in effect, that if the government wished to go ahead with the Pickering airport it should

[Mr. Stevens.]