

dealing with the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton is something like shovelling smoke—I am sorry I cannot accept the minister's point, as he put it, of constitutional philosophy or theology when criticizing the Minister of Transport. I am afraid the minister's remarks this afternoon amounted to the kissing off of just about two million people in my area. He is not only breaking a commitment by the former Conservative government to upgrade and expand Mount Hope, he is also breaking a promise made by the previous Liberal government through his predecessor, the Hon. Otto Lang, reiterated recently, during the campaign and since, by his cabinet colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton East.

My question is: are our fears well grounded? Is this little local concern, as the minister puts it, in the greater Hamilton-Niagara region, really so far down on the government's list of priorities? I ask it because industry, planners, and government have to know.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Chairman, I am obviously not getting anywhere with the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth and I regret that very much, because one of my greatest desires in life is to please him and all the members from the Hamilton area in particular. But what I am trying to say is this: we have every desire, every expectation, every hope of accommodating the airport in Hamilton. My distinguished parliamentary secretary referred to this the other night, as reported in *Hansard* on page 1052, of May 13:

There is no doubt that the people of the Hamilton-Niagara-Brantford area require access to convenient and adequate air transportation service, and this government intends to see that this need is met.

I can only repeat that in emphatic terms. But before spending whatever amount of money is needed, be it \$50 million or \$30 million or \$60 million, we have got to know more clearly what we are trying to do and what is the objective. Circumstances have changed. Promises made in the past are subject to the internationally known rule of *facta sunt servanda*—promises must be honoured. Promises must be fulfilled, but they are also subject to the other well-known international rule of *rebus non sic stantibus*. Things do change.

In this particular instance, as I have repeatedly said, we need to know more about the situation. We need to know what is the proper orientation to be given to the runway, for example. We need to know the possibility for Air Canada to move some of its services from Malton, which is surchargé—very, very busy at this time—and the possibility that some of these flights might go to Hamilton. We need to know that in order to find out what it is that has to be done and what it is that has to be spent.

● (2020)

My hon. friend would like me to repeat the two promises which have been made in the past, and I can make only one promise: that proper expenditures will be met in order to develop services at Hamilton airport.

Mr. Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Well, Mr. Chairman, we just received another soft-shoe routine, this time in Latin, from

Supply

the Minister of Transport. He has covered about 15 points which are angering the people of the Hamilton area, and I am going to have to try to bring the minister's attention to these points.

First, one of the biggest fears in our area is that the Hamilton airport could become the Pickering that never was, a kind of international refuse dump from the congested Toronto international airport. That is what I have been jumping up and down about ever since I was elected to this chamber to try to explain to the people of Hamilton-Wentworth would not happen. We have had assurances from the previous minister of transport that indeed Mount Hope would not become the Pickering that never was. I hope the minister is not suggesting that that is what he is looking at when he is talking about Air Canada and other air carriers going into Mount Hope. I just leave that thought with him for the moment.

The other thing is that we have had many studies. We talk about the need to assess the need for an airport. The need for an airport has existed for well over a decade. The people of the Hamilton area have been demanding, crying and pleading for some sort of expansion of our ticky-tacky facilities which we, as a Conservative government, were on the very brink of undertaking. We allocated \$45 million for that airport. I will get to that in a moment, but in the meantime is the minister talking about yet another study, an eighteenth study, a twenty-eighth study, a thirty-eighth study—I am not sure which—to assess the need for facilities in Hamilton?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to indicate to my hon. friend what needs to be done.

Mr. Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Another study.

Mr. Pepin: I mentioned the investigation and the discussions with Air Canada on the possibility of—and I do not want to continue—I have said it already. My hon. friend is the first man in the history of Parliament who has apparently refused the thought that the presence of the great people's airline at his airport would be a desirable objective.

Again I do not know how to deal with my hon. friend, because I am trying to be as constructive as one can possibly be. I am trying to help the progress of the Hamilton airport, but I do not seem to be able to reach the hon. member.

In his own contribution to the debate I was referring to a moment ago, he said as reported at page 1052:

The consultant's fees of \$220,000 which the Minister of Transport has mentioned, was the amount for the first stage only of the proposed development, that is, the firm conceptual design.

These are going on. What needs to be done is the assessment of what further expenditures need to be dedicated to this airport.

So, I give up, because I have tried everything.

With respect to the commitment of \$45 million I do not want to go over it once again. I have done so. What appears in the books to which I have access is that this was an acceptance in principle of the project by the cabinet, so dear to my hon.