

The Mississauga News



BRIAN L. SARACINI
Publisher



EDWARD BELITSKY
Editor

RON DILLON
Advertising Manager

Published every Wednesday by Inland Publishing Co. Limited at 44 Dundas hwy w., Cooksville, Mississauga, Ont. Tel. 279-2211. Single copies 10c. subscriptions \$4.00 per year in Canada, \$5.00 elsewhere. Member Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association, Ontario Weekly Newspapers Association, Suburban Press Foundation.

What is going on

The whole airport expansion issue is a disappointment to date. So little has been said that is meaningful.

We cannot accept the polished oratory of politicians from adjacent municipalities and professional people quoting blurbs from obscure prophets of doom writing in unknown journals.

We cannot accept statements made by politicians hustling to get into step with an alleged 40,000 protestors who represent a potential of that many votes during the next election.

Where are the experts? Where are the people who engineer airports? Why don't we hear from them?

Apparently the Department of Transport has thus far taken no opportunity whatsoever in defense of its initial decision. It is understood they have a team of analysts engaged in probing the situation at Toronto International Airport at present.

When can we see a report? It should contain unbiased projections on the future of Malton that would be very interesting.

HEADS OR TAILS?

DOT's initial proposal couldn't have been made on the flip of a coin. We are obliged to assume that a great deal of thought, analysis and computing went into that decision.

In view of all this, why is the government so quick in trying to salve the mortally-wounded sensitivities of several hysterical groups of homeowners? Why hasn't the government tried to reason with us by presenting facts, facts, FACTS?

Is it beneath their dignity to delegate someone to go out and acquaint the public with a true perspective on the shape of things to come?

Or are we forced to assume that the government, aware that expansion wasn't exactly such a hot idea, tried to foist it over on the public anyway, keeping their fingers crossed that they might be able to get away without making too many waves? And, being just as vote-conscious as a body as they are individually, they are willing to back down in the face of organized, militant protest.

What are we to think? To date, we have emotionalized left, right and centre, lacking facts to peg our thinking on. We have listened to politicians, self-proclaimed experts and people using the issue to attain public prominence for themselves.

We would do well at the moment to think not in terms of whether or not expansion should be allowed, but rather, exactly how much expansion can we comfortably stand?

If the experts are ready to finally get up and say something intelligible, we are ready to sit up and listen.

We're listening.



Can't they get together?

THIS WEEK AND NEXT

By Walt E. McDayer



Premier W. A. C. Bennett will appear at the three-day federal-provincial constitutional conference, beginning Monday in Ottawa, touting a vision, a dream of a new province that would be Canada's largest, stretching from the 49th parallel to the Arctic.

His timing was perfect. Unsuspecting reporters were gathered in his office, quietly scribbling notes about Governor-General Roland Michener's visit to British Columbia, when master politician Bennett casually dropped his disclosure.

British Columbia would present a brief to the conference, Bennett announced, pressing for a northward extension of the province's border to include the Yukon and

part of the Northwest Territories.

Despite the hoopla of headlines that followed, Bennett's "dream for the North" is not new, but a recurring one. In Whitehorse, 1964, Bennett invited the Yukon and the Northwest Territories to unite with British Columbia. The response was more chilling than the climate. Gately, in 1967 Bennett made a pitch for part of the Northwest Territories, but again received the cold shoulder.

How will the residents of the North react to Bennett's present proposal? N. W. T. Commissioner Stuart Hodgson politely shrugged it off, saying they take Bennett's plans for the North "with a grain of salt." But sea-

soned veteran Bennett seems undismayed.

It is an irony that Bennett is pushing for union with the Northwest just as Northern Ontario is threatening separation from its province. Last month Northern municipal politicians met at Cochrane, and blasted Ontario government policy for destroying the Northland's lumber industry and exploiting the mines. A committee was formed to study the advantages of making Northern Ontario a separate province, and a brief will be presented at a special meeting in January.

At Cochrane, Timmins councillor Don McKinnon rapped "a Provincial Government that is so far

away that it does not care for our problems." If the 450 miles separating Timmins from the provincial capital of Toronto represents too great a distance for effective government, what does this do to Bennett's proposal? It's 1,755 miles from Victoria to Whitehorse.

Premier John Robarts is well aware of the grumbling and grievances in Northern Ontario. He and his Cabinet heard them firsthand during a tour of that area last September. However, Robarts has given little indication that he takes the separatist threat seriously. He's going to the Ottawa conference next week less concerned about the physical shape and size of his province than its stature in relation to the Federal Government.

The Ontario premier has made it clear that he is attaching great importance to the federal-provincial tax-sharing conference, which follows the constitution talks. Robarts has warned that provinces must be treated as equals with Ottawa in the distribution of taxation powers. With the political jargon removed, this means Ontario wants a bigger bite of the personal income tax collected by the Federal Government.

Northern Ontarians feel their province is too large. Bennett's new British Columbia would be even larger. The time seems ripe for a comprehensive study to decide whether provinces are too large or too small, whether there are too many or too few. Perhaps Canada does need some new borders, based on considerations of economics, political representation, language and culture.

Letters To The Editor

Sir,
I would like to join with the editor in attempting to inject a note of sanity and reduce the raging hysteria that has been so prevalent in regard to the proposed expansion of Toronto International Airport.

In particular, I wish to refute some points mentioned in a full page advertisement in your issue of Nov. 27, 1968. This ad, placed by "The Council of Concerned Residents of Mississauga" is rampant with colossal exaggerations and unsupportable premises that are wholly alarmist in nature.

The first point I take to task is the statement that a Boeing 747 Jumbo Jet is equal in noise level to about eight DC-8's flying in close formation.

FACT — Actual noise levels of the new generation of quiet, by-pass fan

engines such as the JT9-D which is used on the Boeing 747, are quoted by the manufacturer as being 11 pndb quieter than present jet engines at take-off power as measured at a two mile point from the end of the runway. In addition, these fan engines are 6 pndb quieter on approach than current jet engines in use. Being 6 pndb quieter is the same as doubling the altitude of an aircraft on approach, i.e. if an engine produces 100 pndb at 500 ft., it will only produce 94 pndb at 1,000 ft. The effect is that the Jumbo Jets on approach will produce a noise level equivalent to the current jets flying at twice the height of their normal approach glide path.

The next statement is that the Jumbo 747 Jet carries a fuel load equal to the contents of four

large swimming pools.

FACT — Let us consider a large pool as being 20 ft. by 40 ft. Such a pool holds 25,000 gallons of water. A Boeing 747 holds 47,000 gallons. Note that this is less than twice and definitely not four times the volume of a large pool.

In the second statement it is mentioned that Toronto International was originally located far from built up areas when the site was chosen. Homes and industries sprang up adjacent to the airport but noise levels and safety factors have not been unduly alarming until recent developments.

FACT — The only reason noise levels and safety factors are alarming now is that people are now in the immediate airport area to notice them and feel affected by

them. If they chose to live there, then surely that is their personal right. But why should a well located airport be moved to suit their convenience. Obviously the airport was well located originally and its location is still ideal. To follow the current line of thinking, the airport would have to be moved every thirty years to allow those who encroach on the airport flight paths to render their objections and obtain satisfaction.

The third statement says that it is an impossible demand upon pilots of the Jumbo and Supersonic Jets to follow noise abatement procedure operating on partial power for take-off and landing.

While I am sympathetic to this cause and am myself a resident in the area affected by airport expansion, I feel it is time

that some measure of fact, instead of fantasy, be introduced to avoid the gross distortion of facts and absurd statements that are being made. Such an approach can only defeat the aims of concerned residents.

To be continued

D. E. Dwyer

FACT — It is only a jet aircraft that has the power and clean design that allows it to follow a noise abatement procedure. The new jets will have the same characteristics as the present jets and there is no reason to presume that noise abatement procedures will create an impossible demand upon pilots. In addition, safety is never compromised when it is a question of following a noise abatement procedure or disregarding it to ensure the safety of the passengers and aircraft.