

*Adjournment Debate*

against the short runway. The caucus committee concurred that a full length north-south runway is needed at this time. It further recommended the new north-south runway should be used for landings only during severe cross wind conditions only.

Does Pearson need two more east-west runways at this time? The Air Transport Association of Canada has provided figures which indicate aircraft movements are down 12 per cent from their pre-recession high. Currently Pearson processes 20.5 million passengers per year, a volume easily handled by the two existing east-west runways.

Travel replacing technology such as faxes and tele and video conferencing are being increasingly utilized with fewer people travelling for business purposes.

Our committee concluded that any additional runways should not be contemplated until the threshold of passengers exceeds 30 million per year. This will not take place before the proposed Canadian airport authority takes over the management of Pearson.

I endorse the minister's decision to complete the second north-south runway for economic and safety reasons. I applaud the innovative plan to turn the operation of airports over to local airport authorities so they can be financed and improved in a self-sufficient, cost-effective, businesslike manner.

I ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport to expand on the concept of the Canadian airport authority for the residents of Mississauga. What assurance do we have that this will be the most efficient and economical solution to Pearson's current problems?

**Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Transport I would like to respond to the question from my hon. colleague, the member for Mississauga West.

Let me first assure my colleague that she can reassure the residents of Mississauga that when the new north-south runway is completed at Pearson it will be used primarily for landings. In recognition of the concerns of the residents living near the airport about noise I want to reiterate that the new runway will only be used 5 per cent of the time when severe cross winds make landings on the two east-west runways unsafe.

The only time the new north-south runway would be used for take-offs would be on those extremely rare occasions when, combined with adverse weather conditions, the existing north-south runway is unavailable due to emergency or repairs. On these occasions only take-offs toward the north following the established departure path of the existing north-south runway would be permitted.

The minister wants to assure the member and her constituents that absolutely no decision will be taken on the matter of additional east-west runways until the Canadian airport author-

ity is in place and functioning at Pearson International Airport. In any event it is anticipated that the additional east-west runways would not be constructed until traffic warrants it. This is not expected to happen until the turn of the century.

• (1925)

One of our colleagues from the Reform Party has said that we do not intend to move on the new Canadian airport authorities for Pearson until 1998. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As the minister has made very clear we will be moving to establish CAAs at many airports as soon as the communities involved identify their representatives and pass the necessary local resolutions which is indeed the case for Pearson. There is no question about waiting until 1998.

The fact is that the local municipalities have named their representatives and the minister has indicated that we will proceed with all that needs to be done at Pearson. The only logical option though is to work with these representatives in an advisory capacity for the time being.

We will move to activate a Canadian airport authority which we believe is in the best interests of the Canadian public as soon as the Senate puts the interest of the taxpayer ahead of its rhetoric.

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 17 I put two sets of questions to the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs. The minister effectively declined to answer those questions at the time saying they were hypothetical. However, the exchange after question period between the leader of the Reform Party and the Speaker would indicate the questions as put were of course not hypothetical and were in order. The questions were in order because they dealt not with the government's political plans but with its competence, jurisdiction, and role in the matters of constitutional law and the possible separation of Quebec.

The first question was formed from a quotation from the Prime Minister of Canada. He said a Prime Minister of Canada has a constitution he must respect and there is no mechanism in the Constitution permitting the separation of any part of Canadian territory.

While that is very narrowly true in fact the Constitution does have provisions relating to amendment of various things that would be required in the event of the separation of a province. These are things as elementary as the transfer of the legitimate powers of the federal government to a province which would generally speaking require the consent of two-thirds of the provinces representing 50 per cent of the population. In other cases where it actually involves institutional change it would require unanimous consent. These clauses are laid out in part 5, sections 38 through 49 of the Constitution Act, 1982.