

*Airports*

Concerning the motion of the Hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) who is asking to have the name of the International Airport changed to National Capital International Airport, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not disagree with the proposal, although—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. We have not yet proposed the motion. Therefore, I cannot give the Hon. Member the floor.

\* \* \*

● (1720)

[Translation]

**AIRPORTS**

MEASURE TO CHANGE NAME OF OTTAWA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

The House resumed debate, from Friday, January 27, 1984, on the motion of Mr. Isabelle that Bill C-207, an Act respecting the International Airport at Ottawa, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mrs. Côté).

**Mrs. Éva Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with the proposal before the House to change the name of Ottawa International Airport to National Capital International Airport, although it may seem rather strange to have the terms national and international together in the same name.

I do not disagree, because the name reflects my concept of the region. In fact, even if Ottawa is legally and in fact the capital of our country, we must remember that the people, whether they live in Ottawa, Nepean, Gloucester, Aylmer, Hull or Gatineau, all feel part of the capital. This feeling has been strengthened further in recent years as a result of the presence of the National Capital Commission and the wide usage of the term: National Capital Region.

I am sure that is the basis for the Bill being proposed by my hon. friend, the Member for Hull. I wish to congratulate him for giving such eloquent expression to his ideas, and he is certainly a great Canadian for doing so.

I am sure that many people in the riding of Hull, as in other ridings and municipalities in the region, agree with the Hon. Member and support the Bill he is defending in the House today. I therefore cannot disagree. However, neither can I agree. Let me explain.

I cannot disagree, for all the reasons I have just mentioned, which reflect that sense of belonging to this beautiful region that is the site of our Parliament.

However, this feeling is an emotional one which, although entirely laudable, may blind us to the practical implications of a gesture that, on the face of it, has no negative consequences.

However, there are negative consequences, serious enough to prevent me, as a Member of this House, from supporting officially—as I indeed do morally or perhaps I should say emotionally—the proposal being made by the Member for Hull.

According to well established policy, the name of an airport must include the name of the principal geographical entity in the region. That is true in the case of Ottawa International Airport. If we look at the population of the various municipalities that belong to the National Capital Region, Ottawa has nearly 300,000 people, compared with some 85,000 in Nepean, 75,000 in Gatineau, 73,000 in Gloucester, 53,000 in Hull, 27,000 in Aylmer, 20,000 in Kanata and 19,000 in Vanier. It is clear that Ottawa is the principal entity in the region, not only geographically but also demographically. According to the policy of the federal Department of Transport, it is entirely logical to keep the name Ottawa in the name of the region's main airport.

Some people might think it makes sense to include the name of Gloucester in the name of the airport, since the major part of the airport is located in Gloucester, with only part of the airport being on Ottawa territory. Perhaps I could give the Member for Hull an example that is closer to home. The CEGEP de l'Outaouais was known for a long time as the CEGEP de Hull, although it is located within the municipal limits of the Town of Aylmer. However, it has never been known as the CEGEP d'Aylmer. Therefore, we cannot say Ottawa-Gloucester International Airport, or vice versa. Similarly, there can be no Ottawa-Nepean airport, even if Nepean is the second largest municipality in the region in terms of population.

In any case, changing the present name of Ottawa International Airport would lead to a host of similar requests, which, if approved, would make things totally confusing for the travelling public, especially for international flights. For instance, we could rename Dorval Airport as Metropolitan Airport, which would be inaccurate, in any case. And what about Aéroport de la vieille capitale instead of Aéroport de Québec? I could go on, but I am sure that my hon. friends on the this side of the House, and perhaps even some on the opposite side, have enough imagination to find similar examples.

My hon. friends opposite will probably jump at the opportunity to argue, according to their own peculiar premises, that we might as well change the name of the airport in Ottawa since that is what we just did with Toronto International Airport. Perhaps I may point out that Toronto International Airport is still known by that name, except that we have added the name of the Hon. Lester B. Pearson, a great Canadian and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize. Thus, the new name of the