

*Adjournment Debate*

many Canadians. The question I asked was in response to the series of tours the Minister of Transport undertook of federal airports at the time of his appointment to that portfolio.

The minister was interested in examining Canada's major airports with a view to not only learning about the capacities of the facilities, but of examining the problems with respect to air transportation of which, of course, there are many. However, no such action has been taken by the minister in relation to either solving air traffic problems or in developing an over all transportation system for the 21st century.

There have been many changes in the direction of air transport policies since I raised the issue a year ago. Negotiations into updating the 1974 bilateral air transportation agreement into an open skies agreement between Canada and the United States are set to begin this week here in Ottawa, which will significantly alter the way air transportation has managed in both Canada and the U.S.

While these negotiations will probably result in a new agreement that will bring increased air traffic into Canada, the government and the Department of Transport have not given consideration as to how they will deal with the problem. The shortage of air traffic controllers for one is well documented.

I believe that two things are essential in this debate. First, Pearson International Airport at Toronto is at maximum capacity and needs to have pressure taken off it. Second, Canada is a country built by transportation networks, first by sea and by rail, now in air transportation and, accordingly, Canada needs some kind of multi-modal system of transportation which will work effectively.

On the first point, I have suggested many times in this place that the government must consider alleviating pressure on Pearson International Airport by diverting some air traffic to Hamilton Airport. There are many reasons for diverting traffic from Pearson International and there are many more reasons why the traffic should be diverted to Hamilton.

As you may recall, because of three losses of separation incidents at Pearson which occurred within a month of each other, a cap was placed on the number of flights that could arrive and depart from the airport, commonly known as aircraft movements.

There are presently only 76 movements per hour allowed at Pearson. Such a situation developed, some analysts say, because of the lack of adequately trained air traffic controllers at the facility.

In addition, testimony from the investigation into the Dryden inquiry air crash indicates that because of delays on the runway at Pearson International during the winter months, planes which are de-iced risk the reoccurrence of ice buildup as they wait on the tarmac for take-off.

Transport Canada has acknowledged that it will deal with the problem by installing more de-icing machines, but the implications for tragedy are obvious. Pearson has outgrown itself. Terminal 3 has added another 24 gates to Pearson and proposed new runways promise increased traffic.

As the President of the Air Transportation Association of Canada noted: "Runways at Pearson have a finite limit. That limit has been reached."

• (1750)

Practically everyone but the Minister of Transport is convinced that what is needed in southern Ontario is a second principal airport to meet the needs of the region to take pressure off Pearson. In fact, in his annual report ending March 31, 1990, Auditor General Ken Dye criticized Transport Canada for failing to deal with deregulation and for funding the network of airports in Canada without clear rationale.

One way to rationalize the system is to develop a network of transportation that meets the needs of the future. In addition, the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Panel charged with studying the environmental implications of new runways at Pearson stated that Transport Canada lacks a master plan to deal with the system of airports in southern Ontario and questioned whether it was appropriate for Transport Canada to be building new runways in the absence of such an over-all master plan. The review panel suggested to Transport Canada that it develop such a plan and consider the roles of other airports in the region.

This is the same view I have taken since having the privilege of becoming a member of Parliament and serving as a member of the transport committee.

In 1989 I chaired a task force meeting in Hamilton at the airport to examine its capacity to accept increased