

[Text]

*ST. JOHN'S AIRPORT—REDUCTION OF RADAR APPROACH SERVICES

Question No. 971—**Mr. McGrath:**

1. Did the government reduce radar approach services at the St. John's airport and, if so, are the reductions within safety standards?

2. Was there a reduction in man-years and in equipment in connection with the operation of the radar services and, if so, for what reason?

[English]

Mr. D. M. Collette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Transport Canada advises as follows: 1. At the time of the question, radar approach services at St. John's airport had not been reduced. However, on May 30, 1980, a notice to airmen—NOTAM—was issued advising aircraft operators that it was planned to withdraw the PAR service at the St. John's airport on June 9, 1980. As scheduled, a NOTAM was issued on June 9 advising that this PAR system was decommissioned. This system was decommissioned to enable the relocation of the glide path on runway 17 during the upgrading and modernization of the existing instrument landing system on that runway. All other instrument approach systems will continue to be operated in accordance with existing safety standards.

2. Now that the PAR system has been decommissioned, it will be removed. The immediate reason for the removal of the equipment is to provide a standard threshold crossing height for aircraft utilizing the ILS on runway 17 which will enable aircraft to take advantage of a greater runway landing distance under IFR conditions. The long-term reason is to remove this old equipment to comply with departmental policy to remove precision approach radar systems at an airport when two front-course instrument landing systems are available on separate runways. It is not expected there will be a reduction in person-years as the approved number of air traffic controllers is unchanged and these person-years will be utilized to provide increased staff for the control tower at St. John's. The number of person-years within the telecommunications support area will remain unchanged.

Madam Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion under S.O. 26

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

NORTHERN PIPELINE ACT

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the amendments to condition 12 of schedule 3 of the Northern Pipeline Act which have been proposed by the National Energy Board, which amendments, if approved by the governor in council, would subvert the intentions of Parliament as expressed in the original Northern Pipeline Act, and could result in the most massive, wasteful and shortsighted sell-out of a non-renewable energy resource of recent times.

I submit personally that the motion meets the test under the rule; second, the question period today indicated why we need this debate; third, if there is to be a cabinet decision before the debate then it would be useless to have a debate after, we need the debate now; and fourth, no government business will be affected if there is a debate tonight, and it will not affect the pension legislation. I urge you to grant leave, Madam Speaker.

● (1520)

Madam Speaker: The hon. member gave the Chair the required notice to ask for leave to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26. In his application the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) raises a number of points. He questions the wisdom and legality of the amendments proposed by the National Energy Board to the Northern Pipeline Act. He wants to discuss whether such changes to the act were ever intended when the House passed the Northern Pipeline Act in 1978. He feels that because cabinet must make a decision soon regarding the ratification of the proposed amendment, the issue requires the urgent consideration of the House.

While the hon. member is quite properly concerned about the importance of the subject, the Chair must determine whether Standing Order 26 is the appropriate avenue through which to bring this subject to the attention of the House. On April 30, 1975, as appears at page 5340 of *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker Jerome ruled that under almost no circumstances can a review of the law be regarded as an emergency provision rather than a continuing legislative concern of this House. Therefore, it does not constitute a proper subject for debate under Standing Order 26.

The hon. member also wants to review the legal authority of the National Energy Board, an entity to which Parliament has given certain powers under the Northern Pipeline Act, for proposing amendments to a schedule of the act. In a similar situation which involved Bell Canada and the Canadian Transport Commission, Mr. Speaker Lamoureux ruled on November 9, 1971, on pages 9467 to 9468 of *Hansard*: