

signal they can pick up may be from an American station, then that is not good enough in this technological age.

**Mr. Ron Atkey (St. Paul's):** Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks to item No. 7 of the motion relating to advances to the airports' revolving fund, particularly the item for construction design in the amount of \$4.3 million for the Pickering airport, Toronto International Airport No. 2. We have had one speech on this subject today, from a member to my left, and I will be addressing myself to a number of his comments in due course. However, before doing so I want to set the record straight about a number of facts. I think facts are very crucial in an important debate such as this.

The first fact is that the expropriations relating to Pickering airport have been completed. Legal title in the lands intended for use as an airport has passed to the Crown. The property owners at Pickering no longer own their property; the government owns it. Therefore, I am somewhat astonished that the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Harney) and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) should suggest there is a possibility that the expropriations can be delayed. Mr. Speaker, the expropriations have been completed.

● (2030)

The minister, perhaps in a moment when he was referring to the legislation rather than to what he might have hoped would be the case, made a statement on May 8 during the committee proceedings dealing with the estimates for the Pickering airport. To paraphrase his words, the minister stated in committee that the expropriations were completed and that if the board of examination recommended that the airport not go ahead there, the Crown would have to decide what to do with the land. The Crown might decide that it wanted to use the land for a park. The Crown would perhaps have to consult the province of Ontario as to the disposal of the land. Perhaps it might in some form or other be made available to the original owners or some other owners, but clearly, Mr. Speaker, the words of the Minister of Transport on May 8 and 10 were to the effect that the expropriations had been completed.

Yet the hon. member for Scarborough West, perhaps to explain the vote that was eventually taken in the committee, in which he supported the government's request for funds to proceed with the project, gave this interpretation of the law and the supposed agreement that had been arrived at with the government: he said that those who wished to have the expropriation completed should be given the assurance that it would be completed, but if they did not wish to have it completed for whatever reason, the proceedings, in effect, in legal terms, should be given a hoist. "Given a hoist", Mr. Speaker: those are the words of the hon. member for Scarborough West. I suggest that is wishful thinking on his part, and wishful thinking at best. Expropriations have been completed, and he and the minister cannot change the terms of the statute.

The second point I want to deal with relates to the motion that was put in the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications originally on April 17, prior to the completion of the expropriations. Then, after a rather lengthy meeting which involved filibustering by members

### *Estimates*

of the Liberal party opposite, another motion was put on May 8 which was finally voted upon. The purpose of that motion should be fully clarified for the record because there has been some misunderstanding, some misquoting and some misphrasing of the particular intent and words of the motion. On May 8 I spoke these words in the committee in support of the motion to delete a certain amount of money from the Pickering airport estimates in the airports' revolving fund:

The intent of this motion is not to kill the Pickering airport. The intent of this motion is to withdraw from the airports' revolving fund the proposed allocation of some \$89 million for this fiscal, and subsequent years. There has already been some \$21 million in previous years' estimates allocated to the Pickering airport. It is still open to the minister at any time following the disposition of this motion to bring before this committee a separate supplementary estimate or an estimate in next year's estimate for the fiscal year 1974 and 1975. However, the necessity of the delaying action is merely because of the statement of intention of the minister in the House and in other public places to the effect that he is prepared to set up an inquiry, a study group, to determine various questions relating to need and location and the configuration and the planning aspects of the Pickering airport... I think it would ill behoove this committee and the House in general to approve some \$89 million in expenditure for a project which may never go ahead. I think it would be the cautious and prudent position for members of this committee merely to reserve parliamentary approval for the \$89 million until such time as there is a firm intention to go ahead with the airport, and the question of need and the question of site location has been clearly demonstrated and proved as a result of the work of the independent study group.

That was the stated purpose of the motion before the committee on which all members of the committee voted. I was surprised that there was some justification put forward at that time, and indeed today in this House, by the hon. member for Scarborough West for the necessity of his approving the Pickering airport estimates, to the effect that some of the property owners would not otherwise have been paid. The very words of that motion, Mr. Speaker, exempted from it, of course, the interim supply amounts that had been given for the Pickering airport and the other airports funded by the airports' revolving fund.

There was some \$20.5 million already available to pay property owners: that was admitted by the minister and his deputy. Moreover, there was an additional \$14 million available in the airports' revolving fund as a result of allocations in previous years' estimates—money which was in the fund ready to be paid to property owners and which in fact had not been spent. There was \$34.5 million in the fund, and I would suggest to the government that this was more than ample to pay those property owners who had expressed a desire to take their money immediately rather than await the valuation proceedings that would take place subsequently. I would challenge the government and the hon. parliamentary secretary opposite to state that the \$34.5 million was not enough and to say that more money is needed this fiscal year to pay the property owners. That motion could have been supported; in fact it was not supported both by government members and members of the New Democratic Party. To me this suggests one thing, that the members who voted against that motion were anxious to have the Pickering airport project go ahead.

Reference has already been made today, Mr. Speaker, to the terms of reference of the board of inquiry or so-called board of examination which was first announced by the