

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): This question of Pickering airport—because this is the one the hon. member is referring to—has been discussed since 1968, more than seven years. There was an inquiry presided over by Mr. Justice Gibson, and it was agreed that at this moment we need something in order to avoid a real mess in the Malton region in a few years. This is what we are attempting to take care of with just one runway, and we will see in these two years what will happen. If we have to go further, we will go further. If we do not need to go further, we will be happy to stop there. So, it is not necessarily integrated into the plan, because at that time there was no general plan for the development of an airport.

Mr. Broadbent: Is there one now?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Yes there is.

An hon. Member: Where is it?

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, at the end of his answer the minister said that there was a plan. Would he either, in the form of making a statement on motions or in some other form in the next few days, provide that plan and outline it to members of the House?

MALTON—REQUEST FOR RAPID INTRODUCTION OF NOISE ABATEMENT DEVICES

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): My last question is with reference to the people now in the Malton area. Would the minister assure us that his department would take the most rapid steps to introduce all the noise abatement devices possible as quickly as possible so the noise effects for the people in the Malton area in the coming two years in particular will be reduced?

● (1130)

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what we are doing. We are rapidly building this one runway at Pickering to avoid an increase in the noise level at Malton. We know that aircraft movements are going to increase considerably in coming years and we want to be in a position to prevent an increase in the noise level. We are taking care of this problem, and I do not know why the hon. member complained.

PICKERING—SUGGESTED CONSTRUCTION OF THIRD TERMINAL AT TORONTO AS ALTERNATIVE

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary for the Prime Minister. A study which was carried out within the Department of Transport and is well known in aeronautical circles shows clearly that a projected increase in air traffic at Toronto International Airport would be provided for if a third terminal were constructed as provided in the original plan. May I ask why the government is going ahead with an airport which the people of Toronto and vicinity do not want—

Some hon. Members: Wrong!

Oral Questions

Mr. Hees:—which is completely unnecessary and a waste of hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers money?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the report mentioned in the premise of the question.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the Prime Minister get that report and acquaint himself with its details and, if possible, stop this very foolish waste of money in which the government is participating?

* * *

[Translation]

BILINGUALISM

QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON CONSTITUTIONALITY OF BILL 22

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Further to the statements he made yesterday to the electors of his riding of Mount Royal, would he indicate to the House what main principle he finds anticonstitutional in Bill 22 and what his government intends to do about this act in view of the unrest it stirs in Quebec?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have never indicated that I find this bill anticonstitutional. On the contrary, I said that, to my mind, the bill is probably not ultra vires, though some parts of it could be challenged before the courts.

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Prime Minister.

In view of his answer, would the federal government give technical assistance with a view to proving that the bill might be ultra vires?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member obviously did not understand my reply. I said the contrary. I said that we do not think it is ultra vires.

[English]

POSSIBILITY OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO GROUPS CONTESTING CONSTITUTIONALITY OF BILL 22—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON INTERVENTION IN COURT PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. In view of what he just said, and in view of the fact that private groups in Montreal are bringing action with respect to the constitutionality of that bill which will eventually lead to the Supreme Court of Canada, would the Prime Minister advise whether it is the intention of the government to provide financial assistance to those groups in the prosecution of this section to the same extent as it was provided to the Indians at James Bay with respect to their rights in relation to that project?