

against excessive overtime being worked at Dorval. His position is supported by a letter from the Minister of Labour of November, 1972. This situation continued through 1973 to the mid-summer of that year when the incident to which the hon. member for Laprairie referred took place.

The real issue facing us is not the matter itself which gave rise to the complaint before the board, but whether action has been taken which is discriminatory and is intended to influence not just the actions of the individual concerned but the actions of every other person in a similar position. In other words, the message, according to the remarks of the lawyer appearing before the board, is clear and it is this, that nobody whose employment stems from this House—that is, no one who is employed by a Crown corporation, or by the public service for that matter—shall approach his member of parliament until such time as he has exhausted all the regular channels open to him. I suggest that it must be clearly established as the right of everyone to be able to converse freely and without restriction with their members at all times.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Herbert: I just want to add that in reviewing the voluminous correspondence on this subject, I do not find anything that would indicate any interference with the case itself. The question has always been one where we have been trying to obtain information to be able to assess for ourselves whether an individual is being fairly treated. It is on this basis that I support the motion of the hon. member for Laprairie. I suggest that possibly it might be better referred to the transport committee since the Ministry of Transport is also aware of the situation. At any rate, I will accept whatever decision Your Honour makes in this respect. I support the reference to a committee so that this matter can be fully studied and all persons will realize that in the future they will not be penalized if they take advantage of what I consider to be their right and privilege to discuss the subject with their member of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege. I certainly support the two government members. We have a similar problem in Winnipeg with the finance branch of Air Canada. Air Canada is not living up to union agreements dating back to 1973. The unions made representations to members of parliament and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) was asked about a month ago to intervene in that labour problem. So far the minister has not offered the services of his office to straighten out the labour problem in Winnipeg, and I believe the finance branch problem of Air Canada should also be discussed by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, the individual merits of the case concerning labour relations within Air Canada do not constitute the issue before us at this time. The issue is whether there has been an effort to interfere with the ability of a member of this House to function in his capacity as a member of the House of Commons. The allegations put forward by the hon. member for Laprairie

Contaminated Foods

(Mr. Watson), supported by other hon. members, are most serious, and I hope hon. members will understand if I take some time to carefully review and consider them before deciding whether to refer this matter to the standing committee. I propose to examine the matter and the precedents carefully, and will try to give a decision on Monday or Tuesday.

* * *

AIRPORTS

PICKERING—SUGGESTED DEBATE PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION BEING APPROVED—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of urgent and pressing necessity to propose a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43. This matter concerns the proposed airport at Pickering. Its urgency results from the advice of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) to this House on Monday, in reply to oral questions, that he hoped the cabinet would soon make a decision on whether to proceed with the Pickering airport development, and his further opinion that, if the development proceeds, the estimated costs would have to be revised, yet such revised figures have not been compiled to date. In view of the fact Air Canada has now indicated that travel is slowing down on the airline, with consent I would move, seconded by the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek):

That this House is of the opinion that the government, before making a decision with respect to building the Pickering airport, should provide this House with an opportunity to have a full debate on the question.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43. Is there unanimous consent that it be debated?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. The motion cannot be put.

* * *

● (1130)

HEALTH

REPORTED CONTAMINATED FOODS CONSTITUTING HEALTH HAZARDS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provision of Standing Order 43 to ask unanimous consent of the House to consider a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In the past few weeks there have been innumerable reports concerning serious hazards to human health in Canada. There have been reports of contaminated hamburger, contaminated cosmetics, contaminated cheese, contaminated cottage cheese, contaminated ice-cream, arsenic pollution, asbestos pollution, all posing serious human health hazards. The Minister of