

Government Orders

method of helping to offset the adverse impacts of airport expansion.

The response of the government has been to undertake an impact study. An agency has now issued an environmental impact statement, the summary of which I have here but which, in total, is several massive volumes. A large amount of public funding has been spent on various studies that compose burden of this report, but what do we have in the end? We have the bald recommendation that the "proposal for three additional runways at Lester B. Pearson International Airport provides the solution that best serves the community at large".

The view of the citizens who live in the area of the airport, the many hundreds of thousands of Canadians who live under the flight paths or, indeed, in the surrounding communities, is to the contrary. They feel that the construction of three additional runways is merely going to compound what are already very serious problems.

I note that as part of this environmental impact process, Transport Canada has invited comment on the report up to July 12 concerning the way in which the impact survey was conducted, but not on the findings of the survey itself. The public's reaction to the survey will necessarily be a more protracted process. It will presumably continue late into the summer and through the autumn, and there will indeed be opportunity for everyone with an interest in this highly important question of airport expansion to offer their views.

The fact is that without some leadership by the government, without a clear indication that it is pursuing the development of alternative methods of transport, thereby ensuring Canadians who live around airports that their concerns and needs are being taken fully into account, I am afraid the process itself is unlikely to offer much confidence to those who have been so adversely impacted by the expansion of Pearson airport.

Equally, if the question of night flights, the question of regulation at the moment is not adequately addressed, then too confidence in this process will be open to serious question.

I want to conclude by stating that while we in the Official Opposition will support the bill, we regard it as a mere drop in the bucket, as it were, of what is required with regard to regulation of air transport in Canada, and particularly with regard to the deleterious effects that a major airport can have on the way of life, the quality of life of the people who have the misfortune of living under the flight paths of a major airport.

I hope the government, in bringing forward this bill, is making a very real commitment to ensuring that those other questions, and serious questions that they, are also being addressed in the most expeditious and sensitive manner.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate today in the second reading debate of Bill C-5, an act to amend the Aeronautics Act and to amend an act to amend the Aeronautics Act.

We have had a chance to visit this legislation in the past, and we are now proceeding to make even more appropriate changes to the legislation that not only affects the mechanics of airline operation and aviation, but protects the safety of those who use the services and those who live beside the areas served.

The act makes a number of very important and positive contributions. I want to go through them very briefly and then deal with some of the areas where I feel some additional improvements can be made within the context of the direction that the government is taking.

For example, the increase in the fines for violations of noise abatement procedures is a good step. If my memory is correct, when we were dealing with this section back in 1986 we argued then that the amounts were too small. This particular bill increases the maximum fine for an individual to \$5,000. The maximum fine for a corporation is \$10,000.

• (1540)

I want to reiterate the arguments I made then. It is still an unfair relationship. Five thousand dollars to a mechanic is a lot different from \$10,000 to Air Canada. I think that the ratio between the fine available for an individual—and let us remember it may be an individual who is only doing what he or she is told, as opposed to