

Government Orders

primarily because the existing agreement does nothing to support job creation, does not allow us to be flexible to support tourist development, constricts us in our ability to attract investment, and makes it much more difficult for Canadians to participate in and grow in international markets.

The bilateral agreement is excellent news for a number of cities in the country. It is in those cities that the airport managers and the airport officials, the chambers of commerce, and a variety of individual industry groups and collective industry groups have encouraged the government to open up. Thus, Canadian carriers can develop through this agreement new markets in the United States and carry Canadians to new cities in the United States. Our options can be developed, as opposed to single carriers. Some examples are Halifax, Moncton, Ottawa, Hamilton, Winnipeg, Regina, Saskatoon, Edmonton, Calgary, and Vancouver, just to name a few.

It is very important to these cities and the cities around them. These are cities where we have seen the development of hubs and that form a central core for regional air traffic.

Halifax, for instance, has become a regional hub for Atlantic Canada. Any of my colleagues who come from Atlantic Canada know every inch of the airport in Halifax intimately and have spent hours and days in the airport in Halifax. Anybody who travels in the region knows it only too well. Some of us even enjoy going there on occasion.

Mr. Angus: Where's VIA when we need it?

Mr. Reid: Believe me, VIA is not the answer. Maybe moving the capital of Canada to the Atlantic would be an approach that would address some of our problems.

Because we are operating under a 1974 agreement, our ability to develop the U.S. markets for our products and services is severely limited. In Moncton, we have a tremendous opportunity for air freight development, but is severely limited. In Ottawa, the business community has to go through Toronto to get almost anywhere in the United States. It is time-consuming and frustrating and does not serve the need of Canada's fourth largest metropolitan area with a booming high-tech industry, with other industries that have grown up in the neighbouring regions, and where access to the United States is

particularly important. This is not to mention the growing tourism business and the attractions that the nation's capital of Ottawa-Hull provide to people in the United States.

In the great city of Hamilton, which is 45 minutes from Pearson Airport in Toronto, there is Mount Hope Airport. I recognize that it is quite flat and wide open and on top of the historical escarpment. Unfortunately, there is very little activity at the airport. It provides an opportunity, if we can develop options into the United States, for what we all know and were taught to believe in Newfoundland, is that the heartland of Canada is the industrial centre of Canada. There are options to Toronto and the Niagara Peninsula, the area to southwestern Ontario. It could be using Hamilton to develop freight and business travel and surely to develop convention travel in and out of Toronto. The options are wonderful. But under the 1974 agreement, an agreement that is 16 years old, that opportunity is not there. Hamilton is a marvellous example of why we need to change this agreement and broaden its parameters.

The economy in western Canada has changed dramatically in the last number of years. In the last six or seven years, we have seen substantial changes in the oil and gas business and substantial changes in the world of agriculture. In cities such as Saskatoon there is a growing high-tech industry. There are cities such as Calgary where there has been a development of a real service industry and where the opportunity to export these capabilities that Canadians have, particularly in the area of services. Manufacturing has grown in the west substantially.

I need not talk again about Vancouver which has this huge tourist potential that was seen with the success of Expo and as more and more Americans recognize that Canada really is the destination of choice and the place that they want to be.

We must be able to address those cities which have so long had a connection with the United States and which have understood the American economy and participated in it in a way that has been very difficult and constrained by the 1974 bilateral agreement. It is those cities and the areas around them that can really benefit economically, that can really grow with access to the American markets, and where we really can see some