

Estimates

I say to the hon. member that if his motion was so important and so appropriate at the time, why is it not before us today? All I see here is some niggling little amount of \$4 million having to do with construction and design. I suspect very strongly that the hon. member for St. Paul's has realized, finally, that his motion was totally inappropriate even if it were proper from a procedural point of view. I say this because the motion would have had the effect of preventing the government from paying those people who wished to be expropriated. I think we have to be fair to everybody in this case.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Right on.

Mr. Harney: I will state now that the fairly rational response by the Minister of Transport to the case which was put before him has resulted, for the time being, in a relatively reasonable solution, which is that there is to be a board of inquiry and, further, that no person who wished not to be expropriated will be expropriated or proceeded against until the board has reported. If the hon. member for St. Paul's felt that his motion at that time was so valuable, I wonder why he does not put it forward on this occasion. He and his colleagues have apparently found another device. I think it is worth while reading a few other items from the committee report. On several occasions the hon. member has suggested that our failure to support his procedural gimmickry at the time amounted to an act in support of the Pickering airport. Let me read to you, Sir, what he has said about the value of his own motion:

The intent of this motion is not to kill the Pickering airport—

This is to be found on page 6:8 of the committee report.

Mr. Atkey: Read the rest of it.

Mr. Harney: I will certainly read the rest of it, and much more. On other occasions, when questioned by the minister, he made statements to the same effect. The minister said:

Mr. Atkey, for my own personal information—do not answer if you feel you should not answer—the other day, when you presented your motion, you said the motion did not have as its purpose to prevent Pickering from being created. Did you say that?

The hon. member for St. Paul's replied:

I said the motion was not intended to kill Pickering. It was intended to delay it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have delayed Pickering; we have delayed it by at least a year, during which time all interested parties will be given a chance to speak before, make depositions before and bring witnesses before the board of examination. If this was the purpose of the motion, then it has been achieved. I continue to cite from the committee report:

MR. MARCHAND: Yes, well, that means that those who voted against it were not necessarily supporting Pickering.

That is an absolutely correct interpretation. I do not know where the hon. member for St. Paul's learnt his logic. I understand he is a lawyer, and perhaps he has different kinds of logic. But it is certainly basic that to take a negative stand against a negative stand does not mean to say one opposes the positive stand. I do not know

[Mr. Harney.]

whether he can follow that, but it is fairly elementary. In answer to the points of the Minister of Transport, the hon. member for St. Paul's said those who voted against it were supporting the government in the sense that the government would be allowed to proceed full tilt ahead. Mr. Speaker, we had already been given a guarantee that a board of examination would be set up and that no procedures would be taken against those who did not wish to be expropriated.

In my view, and in the view of other members of the committee, this was fair enough. After all, the people who were organized to oppose the airport had been asking for these two things, and these two things were achieved. I would say to the hon. member that if he really wishes to stop the construction of an airport at Pickering he might as well work along with those others who wish to stop the airport there. If he simply wants to make political points, let him go ahead. But just as I, standing here, would never question his motives, let him not question mine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said all these nice things about the government there are some un-nice things I want to say.

Mr. Wagner: Right on.

Mr. Harney: Shortly after the Minister of Transport made his statement, there were serious allegations made in the Pickering area that those who did not wish to be expropriated were being pressured. Responses have come from the government benches, but to this date people in the Pickering area are not satisfied that no pressure is being exerted on them. These allegations should be cleared up. I suggest that the relationship of trust which should exist between the state and the people of this area would be greatly enhanced if today the government were to say to the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), "We do not think that your motion is totally in order, but nevertheless it makes sense with respect to paragraph (f) which is a very small item of \$4,310,000 for construction and design."

● (1740)

Since the Minister of Transport has stated time and time again that no construction would commence in the Pickering area until the board of examination had finished its hearings, would it not be nice, as an earnest of his sincerity in this matter, to say, "Very well, we will also willingly and voluntarily cut out of the vote this small item for construction and design and will not go ahead with construction for at least a year, since the board may recommend against the building of the airport"? Would it not, then, make sense for us not to proceed with the construction and design of an airport that may never be built? I appeal to hon. members to consider this very simple point.

Mr. Atkey: I am glad you see the logic of that.

Mr. Harney: The hon. member for St. Paul's, like the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark) and myself, is put in an unbelievable bind today. We are all in an extremely uncomfortable position. I object to this particular item. I think it is silly to go ahead with construction and design and to waste \$4,310,000 on something that may never be built. However, we now know that in order to vote against this item we have to vote against all of item