

Government Orders

Mr. Keyes: "Yes" says the hon. member for Brampton. Good. I am glad he is following me along very closely because the next point, contrary to the point of safety mentioned by the member for St. John's East, is that there is no way to ensure—the ATCers in Toronto confirm this—that a Cessna, a Piper or some small aircraft that decides it wants to take off or land overnight blows a tire, goes over on its wings, the pilot is unconscious and no one knows that that plane is laying there and in comes the big jet from Toronto to land at Hamilton. That is the ultimate.

I wonder if the member could explain the conflict between safety and the lack of it when we do not have the ATCers in the towers to confirm this type of scenario.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I guess we could draw any number of scenarios of "what could" and "what if". My friend from Brampton, the home of Pearson, is close by, 10 miles away in the region of Peel. I think it is important to recognize that the systems provide for the inevitability and situations that my hon. friend talks about.

We have a controlled system throughout which ensures that airplanes can fly in a safe and in an efficient manner. The hon. member talks about St. John's. I will come back to Hamilton. I preface this first of all by saying I am obviously no expert in air travel except that I have flown in more planes, obviously.

The air traffic controller in St. John's plays a function in the use of the category 2 instrument landing system. Category 1 instrument landing system, the plane lands with the system and the air traffic controller is not needed, remembering that what the air traffic controller adds is visibility from the ground that is not there in a system.

Use of category 1, ILS in St. John's, that is not needed. Obviously, with VFR it is not needed either because for visual flight rules it is necessary to see before landing.

In St. John's, we have said: "If the late flight gets in at 12.40 o'clock it is perhaps not going to be able to land because of weather. The category 2 system is essential. The person will be kept in place."

As for a Cessna that has flipped over at Mount Hope, I obviously cannot account for how we specifically deal with that.

Mr. Keyes: You put an ATCer in.

Mr. Reid: No, that is not the answer.

An airplane that is flying around at Mount Hope has obviously got to have contact with a central tower in Toronto. Where the central facility is, I do not know. In our part of the world, they are in Gander and Moncton. The great city of Moncton controls the air traffic in the Atlantic region and also partly over the Atlantic. The same situation will exist.

An airplane is not going to move around a runway in Hamilton without making contact, as my friend for Brampton tells me, with Toronto. If something happens they are going to have to know where this plane is, and they are going to have to be able to make contact.

We can all come up with great, wild and wonderful examples. Our history in our airports and airlines is virtually unparalleled around the world.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The hon. member for York West. Very briefly.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, I have two points. First, the hon. member for St. John's East talks about the unwillingness to reopen the 1974 agreement, which is I do not think quite accurate. The question that we on this side of the House have is not in revisiting and modifying old agreements, but in questioning the wisdom of the minister to go holus-bolus to the extreme and deregulating completely the 1974 agreement.

He also made reference to the fact that the Canadian industry agrees with the government's initiatives. The minister was very quick to point out Air Canada and Canadian Airlines being in agreement. If the hon. member checked a number of the media reports in the last week alone, he would find that both the chairman of Air Canada and the chairman of Canadian Airlines, who are the chairmen of our flagship air carriers No. 1 and No. 2, are getting cold wings about entering into a wide open skies concept.

Would the member for St. John's East who says that the Canadian industry is in agreement—and we have our two major air carriers now asking for the very minimum in terms of negotiated safeguards—tell us how the Canadian industry is in favour when our two major airline carriers as of last week are against a wide open concept of open skies?