

Government Orders

Three airports working in concert, transferring and shuttling passengers back and forth.

In London, England, there is Heathrow Airport and Gatwick Airport. Those are major airports. Gatwick certainly did not start up all of a sudden as a big, major international airport. It was the size of Hamilton.

Do you know what it was that made it work? It was the vision. It was the policy that said let us look at this situation in a multi-modal approach to transportation.

Let us look at the situation, not try to funnel hundreds of thousands of millions of people a year into Pearson International Airport and then have our hon. NDP friend sit in a plane for an hour to take off, because our airports cannot accept all of the planes everywhere at one time. Planes are going to have to wait to take off because they do not circle any more. Why not offer those people an alternative? I am suggesting that Hamilton is the alternative.

I want to get back on track because we are discussing Bill C-5, amendments to the Aeronautics Act, including the increase of the maximum penalty for breaching noise abatement provisions. I do not have a problem with that. In principle I agree with Bill C-5. We will see what will happen when it is brought before a committee on which I will be a participant.

Where I take great exception is with the piecemeal politics being pronounced by the Minister of Transport. I say piecemeal and I will explain. The Minister of Transport, and my hon. friend, have sat on the transport committee for two years because the government did not want us sitting for almost a year. Six ministers of transport in six years. The latest Minister of Transport already—we have not even sat down with him yet—has begun to walk the same well-worn path that his five predecessors have worn thin. To my way of thinking, what is of paramount importance is consistency, consistency of security and consistency of vision.

• (1740)

It is incumbent upon this government to examine transportation and its policies in totality, a multi-modal transportation policy sensitive not only to the environment and to the quality of life of individuals and families

living near and around airports but to any other mode of transportation.

I have great difficulty understanding the direction or purpose of conflicting back to back aviation studies released by Transport Canada. Conflicting, you ask. I have a report before me, *Aviation in Southern Ontario, a Strategy for the Future*. Then across my desk just last week was *Airside Development Project, Environmental Impact Statement Summary 1991*. We have a Transport Canada study of January 1990 and we have one for 1991.

I said conflicting because the January 1990 study outlines the current problems at Pearson International Airport. It examines the existing capacity of the facility and suggests options for congestion relief at Pearson International, among them diversion of aircraft movements to other airports. The document referred to the many—I think there are 52—land based airports within 80 kilometres of downtown Toronto. At least five airports have a potential role in resolving the congestion problems at PIA. That is what the 1990 study said.

The 1991 study just crossed my desk lists. Page 9, point 3, under “Diverting Traffic to Other Airports”, refers to the airports at Hamilton, Toronto Island, Oshawa, Buttonville and Downsview. It says in conclusion that Hamilton airport has received significant investment infrastructure in recent years, and we are all aware of that.

It then goes on to say, if you can believe it:

The fact remains however that airspace conflicts with LBPIA, lack of ground transportation to the Toronto market, consumer preference for LBPIA—

All these reasons and the reasons stated for other airports in the area:

—preclude these sites from offering any appreciable airside capacity increase to southern Ontario—

Imagine, one report a year ago saying “let’s look at the alternatives, let’s look at the other airports surrounding Lester B”, and on my desk last week a 1991 study saying “forget the area airport; it is just not going to work”.

That is where I start to think that politics are starting to enter into this thing somewhere. The government to my way of thinking has to start to build a case for Pickering. It makes sense. It has an airport three-quarters built in Hamilton worth millions of dollars, but it is