

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have a written reply from the CNR which I fear is too long for me to read to the House, but I would be glad to send it to the hon. member immediately.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROPOSED TELEVISIONING OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Steven E. Papproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Will the government assure the House that serious consideration will be given to the report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization concerning the televising of the proceedings of the House so that the Canadian people will not be further deprived of the histrionic and linguistic abilities of the Prime Minister?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DOCKYARD EMPLOYEES' WAGE DISPUTE—INTERVENTION OF LABOUR RELATIONS SPECIALIST

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Since negotiations have broken down at the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt and since the Treasury Board's offer actually increases the regional disparity from 85 cents to \$1.15 an hour for the work involved, would the Minister of National Defence now intervene and ask for an industrial specialist to be immediately assigned?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have already pointed out that the negotiations are under the jurisdiction of my colleague the President of the Treasury Board. I follow them with great interest but am not directly participating.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Skoberg: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgency of the question and since there is a strike in Halifax at the moment, may I direct a supplementary question to the President of the Treasury Board?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member can do so with unanimous consent of the House. I might say that I stretched a point in allowing him to ask his question when the question period was ending. I must now ask whether the House gives unanimous consent.

[Mr. McGrath.]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. The hon. member cannot ask his supplementary. Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CLEAN AIR ACT

MEASURE RELATING TO AMBIENT AIR QUALITY AND CONTROL OF POLLUTION

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved that Bill C-224, relating to ambient air quality and to the control of air pollution, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure today in introducing the second reading of Bill C-224, an act relating to ambient air quality and to the control of air pollution in Canada. The short title of the bill is the Clean Air Act. It deals with the quality of our Canadian atmosphere. It deals with the setting up of a number of monitoring stations across the country, research into air pollution, arrangements for the setting up of air pollution abatement projects, and the enforcement of air quality emission standards from coast to coast and from the international boundary line to the high Arctic.

There are frequent references in this new clean air bill to national air quality objectives, national air quality guidelines, and national air quality emission standards. The word "national" turns up again and again. This is deliberate. We want our clean air regulations to be truly national in scope. We must insist on their enforcement in every province in Canada as well as in the Yukon and Northwest Territories. These regulations dealing with air quality objectives, air quality guidelines and air quality emission standards will, therefore, be truly national in scope. They will not be regional; they will not be provincial; they will not be local. They will be Canada-wide in their extent; they will be Canada-wide in their application.

I stress this point because a number of members opposite have expressed some scepticism. They have accused the government of taking a fragmentary approach to pollution abatement in Canada. I have denied this. I have denied it repeatedly in this House. I can now point to numerous clauses in our new clean air bill to prove my point.

As I said last week during the debate on the government organization bill, this government is opposed to the creation of pollution havens in this country. We want