But Parliament was wise enough to determine that in both cases, once the convict had served 15 years of his sentence, a jury could be formed and the parole ineligibility period could be reviewed and revised if appropriate.

This provision was based on the principles of justice and rehabilitation, two principles which are still very sound today. Parliament added that section to the legislation because it believed individuals could improve.

They considered then, and the argument is still valid today, that the possibility for the parole ineligibility period to be reviewed could be an incentive for the convicts to make special rehabilitation efforts.

I should remind you that this provision was linked to the abolition of capital punishment which occurred in several countries where authorities instituted life imprisonment without any eligibility for parole as a compromise to please both those in favour and those against the death sentence.

[*English*]

No doubt the creation of section 745 was unique in the criminal law of the country. However the section was included in the first reading of the original bill in 1976. It was fully reviewed and discussed by the justice and legal affairs committee at that time before it was finally debated and passed by the members of Parliament.

In fact, rather than the original proposal to have three judges to hear a case, Parliament amended the bill so that a jury would decide the case instead. This was done specifically to increase public participation in the process.

Clearly there was debate and communication in the public arena. Efforts were made to make the resulting judicial review hearings as public as possible.

Let me review briefly how the provision works. I think the Reform Party—

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

[*English*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 93 the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mrs. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Pearson International Airport is a vital asset to the Canadian economy.

• (1920)

I recently chaired a Toronto Liberal caucus task force investigating the immediate needs for runway construction at Pearson. The task force reviewed the available documents and held two public meetings. There were several issues considered: the immediate completion of a second north–south runway; the construction of two additional east–west runways and the impact these runways would have on the travelling public, the economy and the surrounding communities.

Currently air traffic at Pearson is handled primarily on two east–west runways. Five per cent of the time, about 70 times per year, severe cross winds force planes to change to the one available north–south runway for periods of up to five hours, a total of 350 hours per year. Capacity is cut in half, disrupting airline schedules, forcing delays and re–routing, allowing potentially dangerous landings to occur on the east–west runways at higher cross wind limits than are allowed at U.S. airports.

Does Pearson need a second north–south runway at this time? The Minister of Transport recently announced a second north–south runway will be tendered for completion. This construction will not increase the overall capacity at Pearson, only the efficiency and the safety.

An environmental assessment report completed in 1992 recognized that a second north–south runway was needed to eliminate the current imbalance of two east–west with only one north–south. They wanted a safety and operational feasibility of a shorter 4,500 north–south runway investigated. This short runway would have had less noise impact on the local residents.

Two studies were undertaken by Transport Canada and the Canadian Airline Pilots Association in 1992 and 1993. They found that 85 per cent of the aircraft that use Pearson could not land on a 4,500 foot runway. Arriving aircraft would have to be kept at high altitudes of 10,000 feet to facilitate sorting and sequencing. These restrictions would increase the probability of mid–air collision. The operational separations imposed for safety reasons might even result in less capacity than exists now.

Both reports concluded that safety concerns would have to be given priority over all other considerations. They recommended