

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Administration of justice—Enforcement of maintenance orders issued by family courts—Government action; the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon)—National defence—Inquiry whether Canada negotiating with Brazil in purchase of armoured cars; the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson)—Air Canada—Attempted denial of right of member to appear before labour board—Refusal to pay employees appearing as witnesses.

Pursuant to the order made earlier this day, the House will now revert to motions.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

AIRPORTS

PICKERING—TABLING OF DOCUMENT GIVING REASONS FOR GOVERNMENT'S DECISION TO PROCEED WITH DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I realize that many members are concerned about the Pickering because the issues are most complex. Deciding whether or not to build a new aviation facility for the central Ontario region required careful deliberation. The government considered six years of studies, the report of the airport inquiry commission, and then a further inter-departmental review which took into account such matters as broad national policy implications for the longer term growth in the economy, the deconcentration of population and the relative roles of the various regions.

Rather than expound on the advantages and disadvantages of the alternatives to constructing the Pickering airport, I would like to table a detailed paper which explains the rationale behind the government's decision to proceed with immediate development of minimum international facilities at Pickering, to allow for known traffic demands, to permit full consideration of future policies and to come to grips with Canadian desires for the demographic composition of our country. This decision reflects the necessity to meet minimum essential needs while allowing us the time to pursue all other options.

[Translation]

Basically, Madam Speaker, this decision will allow us to avoid a congestion crisis at Malton in 1978-79, take immediate steps towards minimizing the Malton noise problem, ensure that the government has flexibility to respond to changing needs and demands. In proceeding with Pickering we will continue to work closely with other departments including environment, agriculture and

Pickering Airport

urban affairs. There are a number of major outstanding issues that need to be resolved through federal-provincial consultations as well as discussions with the regional and local governments and with the people directly involved. I will keep the House informed of our progress on these matters.

[English]

Pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table a paper giving the rationale for the government's decision concerning Pickering airport.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Madam Speaker, we are disappointed in the minister's statement. We believe our position on a second Toronto international airport has been made abundantly clear.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member means all five positions.

Mr. Stevens: In October, 1972, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) said, after reviewing all the circumstances regarding the need for a second international airport at Toronto, that he remained convinced that the case for a second airport had not been made. In no way has the minister in his statement today indicated any reason why the official opposition in this House should change their view concerning Pickering airport. In fact, I suggest that today's demonstration by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) is a clear indication of the tremendous indecision and uncertainty that runs through that entire department. We have a project that may result in hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars of federal expenditure, yet a decision is being made with so much uncertainty that the minister could not even come into the House at two o'clock to deliver his statement because it was still being written. He asked for time, until five o'clock, to prepare his statement.

● (1710)

In my area of central Ontario we have had similar experiences with high-spending, highfalutin' Liberal government programs. The attitude of the present government, which is caught up with the bureaucracy and the consultants, is very similar to the attitude that apparently prevailed in this country at the time of the boom in canal building. At that time everybody wanted to build a canal. In our area, Sir William Mulock proposed the building of a canal. I invite the Minister of Transport to look at the Mulock ditch. It is still there. No ship has ever been through it, in spite of the fact it was one of the tremendously costly misadventures of the Liberal federal government at that time.

What is being done today will result in a very valuable part of central Ontario becoming known as the "Marchand wasteland". If you can believe and take seriously what the minister says, 18,000 acres will be devoted to the construction of a pint-sized airport with one runway and whatever terminal facilities are required. That sounds very innocent. I suggest, however, that that is the thin edge of the wedge. This government intends to put through a Pickering airport development very much in the style that they originally contemplated when they first made the announcement. Today's performance is purely politically