

*Inquiries of the Ministry***TRADE****STUDY OF SUBMISSIONS OF EUROPEAN TRADE UNION ECONOMISTS**

On the orders of the day:

Is it a fact that the president of the professional Sky-Caps, who has been a porter at Dorval airport for some eight or nine years, and 14 of his fellow porters have been arrested by the R.C.M.P. for carrying passengers' bags at the terminal? If so, can the minister give the reason for this arrest, and did the minister notify the president that he could no longer work at Dorval without his written permission?

**Hon. Leon Balcer (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Did the hon. member give notice of the question?

**Mr. Balcer:** I think, Mr. Speaker, I can answer the question simply. I would like to state that following the great deal of trouble we had at Dorval airport the department decided to bring porters under the civil service commission. In so doing the department invited all the porters engaged in the carrying of bags at Dorval airport to submit applications. Over 40 of the Sky-Caps have submitted those applications and they have been hired; another three refused to take up this offer of the department, and another four or five insisted on certain other conditions and refused to accept the positions offered to them.

This group of professional Sky-Caps kept on working at the airport while a decision was being obtained from the court on a writ of injunction. Pending the decision the department did not do anything as far as these porters were concerned. However, now that a decision on the writ has been rendered, these porters have been notified that they should not carry on their activities at the airport as they have refused the positions offered to them by the department.

I do not know about the arrest of these porters. I just wanted to give the situation to the house and make it very clear that we have offered jobs to all the porters who were working at the airport during the last year.

**Mr. Chevrier:** May I ask a supplementary question arising out of the statement the minister has made. It is said that a writ of prohibition has been issued by the superior court against the Department of Transport, I understand. Does the minister not think that pending the decision of the court those 14 men who have not accepted the proposal of the minister should be allowed to carry bags at the airport?

**Mr. Balcer:** As I said, Mr. Speaker, a decision has been rendered, and following that decision these people were told they had no business working there.

**Mr. John R. Matheson (Leeds):** Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Labour, in the absence of the minister. Is the Department of Labour studying the submissions of the trade union economists from The Netherlands, Sweden, France and the United Kingdom who met recently at Niagara Falls and discussed the methods whereby labour, management and government in Europe have contrived to co-operate more effectively in the public interest?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member poses a very interesting question in general terms, but perhaps it would be more appropriately raised in debate.

**AGRICULTURE****BUTTER—DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. John Charlton (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the orders of the day the hon. member for Leeds asked the following question:

—I should like to address a question to the parliamentary secretary. It arises out of the answer given on March 8, 1962 to this question:

What is the age of the oldest butter now in storage?

The answer given was "August, 1960". Would the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Agriculture advise the house whether the government intends to place this butter, produced in August, 1960, on the market?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no, not as butter. At the present time the butter being offered for sale was manufactured in 1961 or later. All butter manufactured prior to 1961 has been or is in the process of being converted to butter oil.

**PIPE LINES****NORTHERN ONTARIO CORPORATION—EFFECT OF MUNICIPAL TAXATION**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister responsible for Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation a question which stems from the recent legislation passed by the Ontario legislature giving municipalities the right to tax pipe lines. I wish to ask the minister what effect this legislation has upon the revenues of Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation.