

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SUGGESTED EQUAL TREATMENT AND NO LOSS OF PAY FOR EMPLOYEES APPEARING BEFORE LABOUR BOARD—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, under Article 43 of the Standing Orders, on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, highlighted by discussions in this House in the last few days and the response of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. McIsaac) in the adjournment debate of last evening, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane):

That this House, without debate, express its opinion that employer and employee representatives of Crown corporations be treated equally when called to appear before the Canada Labour Relations Board and specifically that employees subpoenaed to appear before the board not be penalized by loss of salary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I presume the urgency of the matter must be reflected in the reference in the first part of the motion to remarks made during the adjournment debate last evening. Therefore, I would put the question to the House in respect of unanimous consent. The motion being proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43, it cannot be debated without unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Mr. Fairweather: Nobody said no.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Was there in fact unanimous consent?

Mr. Speaker: I thought I heard a contrary voice. I will put the question again. The motion being proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43, it cannot be debated without unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which is more of a technical point. I believe the parliamentary secretary who answered last night was not the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. McIsaac). The hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) is the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There being unanimous consent, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain): That is the sort of thing that wouldn't happen if Mitchell Sharp were alive.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Oral Questions

● (1120)

[English]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

AIRPORTS

PICKERING—REQUEST FOR ESTIMATED COST OF COMPLETE AIRPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the minister's statement yesterday that the estimated cost of land and construction of the proposed Pickering International airport would be \$204 million, would the minister indicate if his department has estimated the cost of the completed airport, to which he refers as "other options", and, secondly, would he indicate what is the estimate cost of the infrastructure that will be required to build Pickering, that is the sewage, the water, the road system, etc., and who will be paying?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there would be a lot of figures but I can supply them. I will ask the department to give them to the hon. member.

* * *

URBAN AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED DIVERSION OF FUNDS FROM PICKERING AIRPORT TO INFRASTRUCTURE FOR TORONTO REGION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. In view of the comment of the Minister of Transport that there would be a lot of figures and the Prime Minister's comment in Montreal yesterday that soon it will not be possible to give an airport to a municipality, would the Prime Minister indicate whether the cabinet gave any serious consideration to diverting the funds earmarked for the Pickering airport project through the province of Ontario to the municipalities in the Toronto centred region to aid them in building their sewage treatment facilities, their water treatment facilities, their Go train extensions, their roadways and their subways with a view to helping commuters in that region and to help bring down the prices of houses in that area, instead of spending the hundreds of millions of dollars as is proposed at Pickering?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): All these considerations have been taken into account in arriving at the decision.

* * *

AIRPORTS

PICKERING—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO ASSURE AREA RESIDENTS NOT SUBJECTED TO HIGH NOISE LEVEL

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): I should like to direct my supplementary again to the Minister of Trans-