

LABOUR CONDITIONS

GUARANTEES FOR PARTICIPATION OF CANADIAN LABOUR IN
CONSTRUCTION OF NORTHERN GAS PIPELINE

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour with respect to the pipeline. Some questions about this have been asked already. Can the minister put to rest the assertion which was made by the leader of the Teamsters in Alaska who said he had been assured by the international president who in turn had said he had been assured by U.S. politicians that 2,500 jobs on the Canadian section of the pipeline would be going to United States Teamsters, thus depriving Canadians of those jobs? What guarantees are in place to assure Canadian labour content, and how are those guarantees going to be controlled so that Canadian labour will be assured of the work?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I, too, am aware of the stories the hon. member has heard. I checked them out through our officers in Vancouver who contacted the appropriate people to find out how valid the stories were. They said there was no validity at all to the suggestions to which the hon. member is referring in terms of protestations that Alaska Teamsters are going to take the jobs.

* * *

ENERGY

NORTHERN GAS PIPELINE—DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT OF
SINGLE CONTROL AGENCY

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour did not reply to the question about how this is going to be controlled but I will direct my supplementary question to the Deputy Prime Minister and ask him about the labour provisions in the pipeline agreement and the other provisions. He has mentioned already that there were meetings held last November 16, I think he said, with respect to specifications of the pipe. When is the single regulatory control agency, which is part of the government's plans, going to be set up? It seems to me that that control agency should be participating in that kind of discussion.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a valid point. We are presently working on the legislation, and we hope to introduce it into the House of Commons as soon as possible. It was my hope that it would be introduced prior to the Christmas adjournment, but I am not sure we can make that deadline. However, we will have legislation brought forward just as soon as possible.

Point of Order
PRIVILEGE

MR. WALTER BAKER—ALLEGATIONS RESPECTING MR. ROONEY

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, as you know, I filed with you a notice with respect to a question of privilege concerning the matters to which you alluded earlier involving the hon. member for Bonavista-Trinity-Conception. Subsequent to that we had a House leaders' meeting, to which Your Honour referred and at which you announced your decision, on which there was agreement to call in authorities for an investigation. In view of that matter having been dealt with at this time in the way in which Your Honour described earlier, I wonder if my question of privilege might be held in abeyance for a time.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the action by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton to protect his right to rise at a future time on a question of privilege. The matter will stand in abeyance pending the investigation.

* * *

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With deepest respect, I do not question a ruling of the Chair but I seek clarification on a certain point. A while ago I asked a question of the Deputy Prime Minister and he agreed to look into the matter, and in due course, I presume, make a report—in view of the fact that he was apparently not aware of the circumstances or the full details. I did have a supplementary question concerning a very important fact which I thought should go along with it, and I felt the Deputy Prime Minister should also be prepared to look into it, namely, that Gouzenko—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I was one of two members who was denied a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Leeds will recognize that several of his colleagues were not recognized for questions today, and that some did have supplementaries which they wished to pursue. The Chair is in the difficult position of attempting, on the one hand, to distribute the sharing of the question period as widely as possible and, on the other hand, to permit hon. members the opportunity to pursue subjects with some diligence. In some cases, particularly cases where the answer is that the minister has not been briefed on a matter but will provide information at a later date, certainly that seems to be one case in which it would be inopportune to proceed with supplementaries.

There were other questions. I think particularly of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham who sought to pursue a matter by way of a supplementary question. I could think of others if I thought about it for a minute. The fact of the matter is that several members were permitted only one question today. That is a decision I have to make. If we were to permit members second and third supplementaries at all times as a matter of course, we would find that only eight or nine