

Estimates

It is easy for the Alberta government in that situation to try to pressure us. We had public hearings about the national parks and listened to the representations made. Now, they are having their own public hearing outside the park, and we will do exactly with them what we have done—we will go and make a presentation but I did not think that it is advisable at this juncture to mix "le tout" of the government, since I have no authority for Alberta territory outside the park. Inside the park is our responsibility, and we intend to discharge it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member will agree with me that I stand today in my place to defend the interests of the west, to defend and protect the operation in Banff and Jasper. He should be grateful and tell the House that we have made the right move and that he was saved by the bell—by the President of the Privy Council because if we had not succeeded in the procedure—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. minister but the time allotted to him, plus extra time because of the point of order, has expired. Hon. members know that the Standing Order might give him the status of a 30 minute speech instead of 20 minutes, but I am informed by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council that ministers who reply in this debate consider themselves to be 20 minute speakers. If this is so, the time has expired and the minister could only continue if he were given unanimous consent. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude by saying to the hon. member that he should be happy. We were almost obliged today to close Banff and Jasper. Now, he should be relieved and call for—

Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain): Blackmail.

Mr. Chrétien: No, it is not blackmail. I can give the list that I read here. It is very clear. The fire protection service from the Alberta government published it, so I hope it is a good one. All the camp sites in Banff and Jasper are operated under contract rather than by the department. If we had been obliged to accept the vote we would have been obliged to close all but one, Tunnel Mountain. It would have been the same thing with the catering service. It serves 290 employees in the park at a cost of \$200,000. It would have been the same thing with the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires. We would have been obliged to fire those people and close down the operation. The hon. member for Rocky Mountain and I will not be forced to do that because of the wisdom of the President of the Privy Council.

● (1720)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I take it that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Rocky Mountain will be dealt with initially and, hopefully, finally by the minister and the hon. member for Rocky Mountain.

Mr. John Harney (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak this afternoon briefly on part of the matter before us. It has to do with the part of the motion presented by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen)

[Mr. Chrétien.]

relating to vote L30 of the Department of Transport, and has to do with the expenditure of \$4,310,000 for the construction and design of Toronto International Airport No. 2 at Pickering.

There has been a great deal of debate outside and inside the House during the past year or more on this important matter. As we know, people in the Toronto area and elsewhere are opposed to the construction of that Pickering Airport. Sometime ago, when it was announced that a second international airport would be built at Pickering, many people had good reason to think that the action of the government was ham handed; indeed, some called it dictatorial. Since then there has been a considerable amount of motion on the part of the government, not necessarily in the direction that most of us wanted. It has not been all that rapid; some of it, however, has been in a proper direction and some of it has been swift enough. I should like to review some of the changes in attitude that the government has gone through as a result of the significant pressure put upon it.

Many of the people who opposed the airport sought two things in the main. They requested, reasonably, that the whole decision to build the airport be reviewed thoroughly. They had reason to think that the decision to build a second international airport near Toronto had been a hasty one. Many felt that as the Department of Transport realized a number of years ago that there would be extra demands for air service in the Toronto region and as the then minister of transport had made the commitment to the people in Malton area that there would be no expansion of Malton, the department and the minister had probably acted in the normal, standard way and said, "We need more air facilities; we are in the habit of building large airports; we shall build another large airport in the Toronto area." Apart from that, it was probably felt that this kind of thing was politically saleable.

It is only in relatively recent history that the citizens of this country have objected to major capital projects being undertaken in their localities. In the past, people were expected to welcome government expenditures. But the mood has changed, Mr. Speaker; it certainly has changed in the Toronto area. Some years ago the movement to stop the building of an expressway in the Toronto area was ultimately successful and the building of that expressway has been stopped. This is certainly a first for Toronto and, indeed, I might add, for Canada, and perhaps even for North America. The people of Toronto said, "The kind of development you are proposing and which you claim is good for us is not going to be good for us and we reject it." The same kind of thinking arose behind the opposition to the building of the Pickering airport. Indeed, the government must have been surprised to discover that many people, not only those coming from the immediate locality but many coming from outside the area, were opposed to the building of the airport. The people of the area said, "No, we do not want that kind of expenditure in our locality. We do not want that kind of capital construction. We do not want that kind of disruption of our way of life. We want to see public money invested in a different way."

As a result of fairly extensive debate the government, as I suggested a while ago, moved. It changed its position slightly. It has accepted that there should be set up a