

Supply

The big difficulty I have, as the hon. member for South West Nova is aware, is the simple fact that this program is not funded at a level needed to proceed with the amount of work that municipalities from Vancouver to Halifax would like to see. This is regrettable but there are, unfortunately, limitations.

The hon. member also mentioned something about small airports. I do not know if she had a particular airport in mind but I thought the question was fairly general. She asked what was spent on municipal airports in Nova Scotia. I find that in Nova Scotia, for Liverpool it is \$57,600; Waterville, \$56,000; Digby, \$80,200; Trenton, \$183,100; in Debert, \$60,500.

The capital funding aspect of this program was shot down in August, 1978, but the operations aspect is still alive at the level of \$10.7 million. This is to support the operations at small airports. However, the capital funding no longer exists.

Members of the House who have such projects will regret this but "to govern is to choose", and there are so many major expenditures in major airports for which the federal government has stronger responsibility and which need capitalization for equipment that the federal government had to slow down its involvement in municipal airports.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the minister for his answers on South West Nova. I wonder if we could come back now to the Toronto international airport. I was intrigued by the minister's comment that he has to take money away from small airports to spend on needed projects in big airports. I want to assure him that if he has to slow down expansion plans at Toronto international, then I and the residents in my area will help him do that.

I asked the minister whether the extension of ground facilities at Toronto international would lead to expanded use of the airport and greater numbers of aircraft landing and taking off at Toronto international.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Chairman, if anybody would like to ask something else on transportation, I could collect the bits and pieces of paper necessary to give an answer to the hon. member.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I will add a couple more questions. If it is not possible for the minister to answer at the moment, I will be happy to wait until he is able to do so.

I am obviously concerned about the addition of the fourth runway at that airport. I should like to stress to the minister that a commitment was made, subdivisions and homes were built, local planners responded in trust to the federal commitment and home owners have purchased homes there in response. The addition of a fourth runway would be an intrusion on those subdivisions and in a sense would be a violation of trust with the home owners who accepted our commitment. It is the addition of the fourth runway that concerns me most.

● (1630)

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Mississauga North has a very interesting theory, and I was delighted

to hear it. It seems to be a new theory which relates the number of people living in a certain area to the number of passengers, at least the way I understood it. No? I will start again.

The straight answer is this. Extension plans are in response to normal growth of traffic only. So there is no great philosophy behind it. You have the traffic, you have the needs, they are assessed and then you build whatever needs to be built. Presumably some people would like to build for the needs at hand, for today's needs, while others who think in more sophisticated terms would like to build for what will be needed in years to come.

The Department of Transport has sometimes been accused of looking a bit too far into the future. But at the moment we cannot afford it anyway. So the first answer concerns the relationship between normal growth and capacity.

The second answer, which is the most important from the member's point of view, is that there is no study now under way concerning a fourth runway. That is one for the future. I do not know what will happen but some day when the Toronto area needs have to be met, needs which cannot be satisfied by Malton, perhaps something will be done. In the meantime, a number of studies are being done to find out how the traffic can be decongested at Malton and rerouted to other airports in the area. Some people have mentioned that Hamilton might take some of the traffic. This is the kind of thinking that appears to be going on now.

The third question asked what is being done about noise abatement. The first thing is the way a runway is oriented. That is to say, the way in which different runways are used at different times in relation to winds, the time of day and such factors. The second point, which I had already started to answer, is that there are special takeoff and departure techniques. I was given an illustration of that the other day. The third is installing a noise monitoring system. I hope this is sufficient information, but if not I will exchange correspondence with the member for Mississauga North of the type which we have already started on another subject.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre.

Mr. Benjamin: My riding is Regina West now, Mr. Chairman. They took a lot of my farmers away from me but I am going to say something for them anyway.

I have a number of questions for the Minister of Transport and a couple of hours ago I sent a note over to him listing them. He has answered one of them.

The first three questions I would like to put to him are of a local nature, but their ramifications concern many places in the rest of Canada. First is the issue of rail line relocation. The minister knows that a few days ago my colleagues the hon. members for Winnipeg North and Winnipeg North Centre, and I believe one of the Conservatives from Winnipeg, raised the subject of rail line relocation of the CPR yards in Winnipeg. I hope that is being actively planned and prepared for. However, I hope the minister will also say that Winnipeg will