

*Airports*

airport in Toronto respects the letter and intent of Transport Canada's policy.

It not only respects our domestic policy but also international standards according to which the name of international airports must refer to the name of the principal geographic entity served by the airport concerned.

In terms of aviation safety, for over twenty years the International Civil Aviation Organization has been examining the designation of airports. The standard set by the ICAO and observed by all member States, including Canada, prescribes—I am not using the same terms—that the name of an international airport must include the name of the localities served and the name of the airport. On that basis, we could possibly rename Ottawa Airport as Ottawa National Capital Airport. However, this is a tautology if there ever was one, and it adds nothing for Canadians who already know that Ottawa is their national capital. Nor does it give anything more to the Quebec residents of the Ottawa region—ably represented by the Hon. Member for Hull—since the name Ottawa is still there. If I may guess about the motivations of the Hon. Member for Hull, I would say that he wants the word Ottawa taken out of the name of the airport and call it the airport of the region as a whole. However, because of the policies of Transport Canada and the international agreements, the word Ottawa has to stay.

I would also mention financial reasons which prevent me from supporting the commendable Bill of my colleague from Hull. Indeed, expenses for new signs at the Ottawa airport and for advertising the new name are not justified, if only because the aim of the Hon. Member for Hull, which is to eliminate the word Ottawa, would not even be reached. Besides, I hardly think that national unity, of which my colleague from Hull is such a strong advocate, would stand to gain from the change he has in mind. I would even suggest that the change might raise a controversy among Quebec residents of the Ottawa region since the Gatineau airport serves the same region as well.

I would not want my colleagues in the Official Opposition—I was going to say permanent—make comparisons with the new name of the Toronto airport and the expenses incurred as a result of that change. I think that the memory of Lester B. Pearson and the ideals he defended all his life deserved to be recalled to all Canadians by naming after him the Toronto International Airport, Canada's largest. The expenditures involved in the case of Toronto can thus be historically justified.

Since I am on the subject of expenditures, I might remind Hon. Members that under an upgrading and expansion program, the Ottawa airport will have a larger passenger terminal as well as redesigned access roads and parking lots. The work should be completed in 1987.

The Ottawa airport has become a source of inconvenience to regular users and people visiting the National Capital Region.

Passengers are fully aware of those problems: during peak hours, there are very frustrating bottlenecks and delays, so there is no need to make matters worse by changing the name.

The proposed improvements reflect the region's new tourist facilities such as hotels and the convention centre. Along with the Rideau Centre development, which plays a catalytic role in the local economy, the airport project will help attract investors and support the diversification of Ottawa's economy.

In 1981, roughly two million passengers used the Ottawa airport and, according to forecasts made by Transport Canada in August 1982, the airport will have to accommodate 2.7 million travelers in 1991. Those people will not see any advantage in using the National Capital airport rather than the Ottawa International Airport.

I do not know whether the Hon. Member for Hull has discussed his project with his colleagues from Western Quebec or the authorities of the Gatineau airport. But I am convinced that the objections to this proposal could be numerous and vigorous. I do not know why we should agree to a name change which, while doing nothing useful as such, could be harmful to another airport in which so much money and efforts have been invested.

On this point, I would like to remind the House that normally, to make such a change, the opinion of the community whose image could be affected has to be polled. To my knowledge, there has not been any such consultation.

I would also like to remind the Members of this House of the background of the airport whose name the Hon. Member for Hull proposes to have changed. During the twenties, there was an attempt to lay out an airfield where the Ottawa airport is now located to be used by airplanes. This endeavour had mixed success, at least until the *Spirit of St. Louis*, piloted by none other than Charles Lindbergh, landed at the airfield in 1927. Following this, the Ottawa Flying Club was created in 1928 and the Upland Realty Corporation rented the airfield for pilot training. Then, in 1936, Laurentian Air Services purchased the airport on a contract basis and sold it to the Department of Transport. It was at that time that the name of the Ottawa Airport came to be used.

From the early days of aviation and until the Second World War, the custom was to name airfields after famous civil or military pilots. For instance, the Toronto International Airport was called Bishop Field, the Winnipeg International Airport, Stevenson Field, and the Calgary International Airport, McCall Field. This practice spread throughout the country except for Ottawa. To my knowledge, the Ottawa Airport was never known after any person; it was always called the Ottawa Airport.

After the Second World War and with the immense growth in popularity of aviation, it became the practice to designate the airports by the name of the major city, community or region they served, especially in the case of major airports. I