

Aeronautics Act

intends to do. This is a matter of particular significance to the municipalities which I have the honour to represent because should the minister, for some unknown reason, decide to select a new site, he will be upsetting the regional plan for the Norfolk-Haldimand region which I represent. Officials and municipal representatives have been working for almost a year to bring out this plan and, as I say, it would be totally upset were the minister to decide of another location for the airport. The mayor of the Township of Haldimand, Mr. Dave Pearson, spoke to me some time ago asking me to do all in my power to persuade the minister to make an early decision, hopefully, to expand the airport at Mount Hope.

The need is urgent since more sophisticated electronic equipment for instrument landing is badly needed at Mount Hope. Many a time I have stood at the airport there waiting for a plane to come from Windsor or Pittsburgh, or Ottawa or Montreal, only to see the airplane make a pass at the airport, find the fog too dense to land, and fly on to Ottawa or Malton where suitable installations were in place to enable a landing to be made. This caused personal inconvenience, but I was only one of many who were unable to get aboard.

Expansion of the facilities is necessary to serve not only the great industrial city of Hamilton, and the Niagara area, but also to meet the needs of the new industrial complex which is taking shape in Nanticoke in the midst of my riding. There, Hydro has built the largest thermo-generating plant in North America; Stelco is installing a rolling mill and a totally new steel-making process which will come into operation very shortly. In addition, Texaco Canada is building the largest oil refinery in North America on this site. All these new facilities are looking to be served from the nearest airport, which is at Mount Hope. This being the case, it is surely incumbent upon the minister to get on with the job and let us know when Mount Hope is to be expanded. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I have written to the minister on this matter. I think I wrote him as long ago as February but have not yet received a reply. We are wondering why a decision has not been announced.

● (1250)

Let us not leave the municipalities hanging in limbo and in uncertainty. Let us say we are going to expand Mount Hope. I have talked to residents living in the little village of Mount Hope, and they tell me they have become accustomed to aircraft landing and taking off. Many of them live there and do not even notice it is happening. In addition to that, there are new homes which have been built in that village with full knowledge that the airport was there. Therefore the argument cannot logically be made that it is going to do any great harm to the local residents in the immediate area of Mount Hope. This is where the ad hoc committee is going to recommend to the minister that the least resistance is coming from in that particular area, so let us get on with Mount Hope.

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a few things I want to say on Bill C-40. Let me say at the outset that one of the difficulties and dangers we are facing in

Canada is the continuous build-up of bureaucratic boards and tribunals, and the build-up of power in the hands of the minister or the governor in council to regulate or change regulations, without reference to parliament and without provisions for appeal. The regulations have the force of statute and remove from parliament much of its power and authority. There is no reason, in my mind, why regulations cannot be attached to legislation, debated, and be examined by a committee before the legislation proceeds to its final stages. In Bill C-40 we see a move away from this direction once again.

I want to read into the record a letter I received from a constituent, on the contents of Bill C-40. This gentleman is an aviation consultant, and his letter to me covered the bill so completely that I think it is proper to read it into the record in its entirety. The letter is dated May 3, and it reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Kempling:

BILL C-40, AN ACT TO AMEND THE AERONAUTICS ACT

On March 9th, 1977, Bill C-40 was given first reading in the House of Commons in an effort by the government to effect certain amendments to the Aeronautics Act that would result in the provision to the Minister of Transport powers that would have far-reaching consequences for the aviation community. I have read this bill carefully and I have grave concerns over its content and the ultimate effects to the Canadian people should it become law.

For several years, Transport Canada has been attempting to implement a full cost-recovery program with respect to the utilization of airport and aviation facilities in Canada, and on page 1, paragraph 2, you will find legislation proposed that would empower the minister to impose charges for airport facilities and services. If the existing Aeronautics Act is not appropriate for these purposes, then one must ask about the minister's authority to levy the current charges. It may well be that Transport Canada would find it easier to implement its own charges under this proposed legislation without involving Treasury Board, and this may be the case. If so, then this amendment would not be in the best interests of Canadians or the government that represents them. A minister should not be allowed to set up his own charging schemes without opportunity for scrutiny by the House and Treasury Board. In recent years, we have become increasingly concerned over the high cost of administrative activities within Transport Canada that seems to drain the minister's resources, not to mention the operational cost and debt that is attached to Montreal's Mirabel airport, and this new attempt by the minister to establish his own authority for the setting up of user charges cannot be allowed to take place.

Further, in this section 5, you will find the following subsections which, I believe, encroach upon the rights of all Canadians:

Subsection 2 provides that owners and operators of aircraft may be required to deposit security with the minister to ensure full payment of charges to be imposed upon such owners and operators in the next following year.

Since all pilots, duly licensed, are, in fact, operators when they are at the controls of an aircraft, this legislation would mean that the minister could force every pilot in Canada to place a bond or cash on deposit with his office before re-issue of the pilot's flying licence could take place each year or every six months, depending upon the type of certificate held, even if there was no planned intent by that pilot of requiring use of those airports and/or facilities which might attract payment for services. What about the thousands of pilots who fly for recreation and personal transportation and never use DOT facilities? What about the thousands of Flying Farmers whose aircraft are operated solely from private aerodromes and often are not even equipped with the avionic equipment necessary for operating into and out of DOT airports? Should these Canadians be forced to deposit \$100 or \$500 each year as a security bond? That would be ludicrous!

In these regards, what has happened to the accepted manner of doing business of paying for goods or services rendered when those goods or services have been provided to the satisfaction of the customer? Just because one might consider buying a certain commodity, should that person be required by legislation to place on deposit a security bond for the, as yet, unpurchased commodity? Will the minister's wishes be granted and he be allowed to force every pilot to place a