speaker, one has some familiarity with the dilemma created in changing the name of an airport which serves more than one municipality. It is always a contentious issue. Frankly, I thought the Department of Transport had resolved the basic issue. It established the principle that airports should bear the name of at least the area they are serving, if not specifically the municipality, in order to obviate the need to make a decision as to what name to put on international airports.

The reason for changing the name of the Toronto International Airport located in Mississauga at this time specifically relates to partisan politics. I appreciate the intentions of the Hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) with regard to changing the name of the Ottawa International Airport to Ottawa-Hull. When I go home, I land at what most Torontonians will continue to call the Toronto International Airport no matter what official name is put on it, or I drive down a highway which we know as Highway 401 notwithstanding the fact that for good and noble reasons the highway bears signs which indicate "MC" and the road is officially named the Macdonald-Cartier freeway. It has been officially designated as such for a long time, but no one in Toronto drives down the Macdonald-Cartier freeway; they drive down Highway 401, because that is the name by which they know it.

When one gets involved in the question of changing established and accepted names of transportation facilities, one could argue that if the airport in Ottawa is changed to the Ottawa-Hull International Airport, people would probably still call it the Ottawa International Airport anyway or, if it were called the National Capital Airport, for a time at least people would call it the Ottawa airport.

I do not think these things should be done without a great deal of thought. The Hon. Member for Hull rose last week to make a very good speech and received quite a lot of support for consideration of the development of a formal national capital region. His Bill concerned expanding the boundaries of the official national capital. A number of Hon. Members, including the Hon. Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick), made quite sensible suggestions indicating that we needed to consider the designation of a federal area to become the national capital. Presumably such a designation would have some name decision attached to it. If the name of the region were changed, it would lead to the changing of the name of the airport. That makes sense to me. However, surely the basic policy has to be the one adopted by the Department of Transport.

Most people fly to what they think of as a place. One flies to Vancouver, Winnipeg, New York, Miami or Paris. Not many people know whether the municipalities in which those airports are located bear the same names. In Toronto, one flies into the municipality of Mississauga, but it never made sense to anyone, except the Mayor of Mississauga, to change the name of that airport to the Mississauga airport. Its origins were as the Malton Airport because in fact in its early days it was in the municipality of Malton. It is logical to say that people travel to the area most people know as the area of Toronto and therefore the airport is called the Toronto International Airport. That is the area to which most people think they are going or going through.

I would like to make a distinction between what the Hon. Member said last week about the need to make the national capital region include territory from both provinces and the fact that even when that is done and the territory's name continues to include the name Ottawa, people will continue to believe that they are flying to Ottawa. Therefore it makes sense to name the airport after the region. As long as people refer to this region as the Ottawa region, it makes sense for them to fly to Ottawa.

As far as his proposal concerning the use of the name National Capital International Airport is concerned, it would be simpler to use the equivalent of the Washington situation and just call it the National Airport. I believe the reason for that name being used in Washington was that there was more than one airport. At least that was part of the reason the names of persons were used in New York. Obviously, if there is more than one airport in a geographical area, they cannot be referred to by the same name and the tendency is to find some other name designation.

I hope this whole matter will come up for further study. I did not speak on it last week because I was hoping for some progress from the Hon. Member's Bill. However, I see this Bill in the context of the larger question—what do we do about last week's issue? If we resolve that issue, then I think this issue follows.

An Hon. Member: What was the issue last week?

Mr. Bosley: Lask week we talked about the potential suggested by the Hon. Member for Hull with respect to redesignating the name or the area of the capital to include part of Hull. His suggestion was that we ought to consider the establishment of a true federal district which would be the national capital region, truly designated and distinct from one or either of the provinces. It is in that context that I see the question concerning the name of the airport to serve the area, whatever administrative units are designed to deal with it. In that context, I would encourage the Hon. Member to continue the thrust that underlies this and the other Bill.

• (1630)

Finally, as a user of both airports, I have some sympathy with the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher) who talked about the urgency pressing upon the Parliamentary Secretary and the need for moving expeditiously on the sign changes.

I wish to make a comment as a user of both airports. We now have a fascinating position in what is officially the Pearson Airport, which I will continue to refer to as the Toronto Airport. I say this because the Hon. Member for Hull is here. I will take only one minute to explain the problem to the Parliamentary Secretary. It is an airport issue related to what the Hon. Member for Mississauga North spoke about.