

*Transport*

heard some noes. However, they were not very distinct so I wonder whether I might put the question again.

[*Translation*]

The motion moved by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) pursuant to Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), seconded by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard) moved:

That when the June 24 and July 1 holidays fall on a Tuesday, the House shall not sit on June 23 and 30.

Does the House agree to the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

Motion agreed to.

\* \* \*

● (1110)

[*English*]

**CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY**

SUGGESTED INQUIRY INTO PROPOSED LAY-OFF OF THREE THOUSAND MAINTENANCE WORKERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to move a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43. My motion is based on the announcement by the CPR that it proposes to lay off for 11 weeks 3,000 maintenance workers. I would therefore move:

That this House instruct the Minister of Transport to meet with the railway unions and the CPR to discuss the proposed lay-off of 3,000 maintenance workers for 11 weeks this summer and to inquire into the effects of such lay offs on the movement of grain in the 1975-76 shipping season.

The motion is seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion is proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43 and cannot be debated without unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

**TRANSPORT**

PROPOSED STUDY OF RAPID INTERCITY RAIL SERVICE AS ALTERNATIVE TO SHORT HAUL AIR SERVICE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to move a motion under rule 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that plans for the development of the aircraft known as the STOL plane for intercity traffic using the Toronto Island Airport will

[*Mr. Speaker.*]

cost the taxpayers of Canada in the fairly near future hundreds of millions of dollars, and in view of the fact that a cheaper alternative to a short-haul intercity passenger air service could be met by developing better use of rapid intercity rail service, I move:

That this House instruct or request the Minister of Transport to refer this particular aspect of his transportation policy to the transportation committee of the House and set up a public inquiry where interested citizens and experts may state their views on the matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 43 this motion cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[*English*]

**EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO ARGENTINA—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF CONTRACT CONTAINING PROVISION FOR SUBSEQUENT NEGOTIATION OF SAFEGUARDS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister on the subject of the sale of a nuclear reactor to Argentina. Is it the position of the government that the contract for the Cordoba nuclear generating plant, which was made effective by an exchange of letters in September, 1974, made provision for subsequent negotiation of safeguards and, if so, will the government table the documents containing those provisions for the subsequent negotiation of safeguards?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is yes, the contract is subject to a bilateral agreement on safeguards. Indeed, I had a conversation with the Ambassador for Argentina this morning, and next week our ambassador in Buenos Aires will be having discussions with the foreign minister of Argentina on the negotiations that have been proceeding for sometime toward the completion of the safeguards agreement. There are two particular points outstanding about which I spoke to the ambassador this morning.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, will the government table the provisions relating to the contract of September, 1974 which make allowance for the subsequent negotiation of safeguards? Furthermore, will the government inform the House when the Atomic Energy Commission of Canada was first informed that the contract, which it thought was completed and was acting on, was subject to further negotiation of safeguards?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I will try to comply with the request of the Leader of the Opposition. I am informed there is no doubt about the fact that the fulfilment of the contract itself depends upon a bilateral agreement on