As far as I know, the Canadian government has never changed its view which was that we would admit observers from the PLO, but not known terrorists.

I therefore ask again, Mr. Speaker, as I did on March 1, how can the Canadian government, after signing the agreement with the United Nations last December, continue to say it will exclude from Canada members of the PLO who are known terrorists? That agreement obliges it to admit them when they are invited or designated by the United Nations Secretary General to attend Habitat.

Does not the signing of this agreement mean that to this extent the policy stated by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration last November 18 has been changed by the government? Also, how and why has this been done without a word of explanation and justification by the government to parliament and the Canadian people?

A more complete answer to these questions would be of interest, I think, to the many Canadians who, like myself, want to see the Habitat conference held in Canada next summer but who do not believe that to do so it is necessary for the government to abandon completely Canadian sovereignty when it comes to enforcing our law as to who is admissible to our country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the minister, and because of the illness of his parliamentary secretary, I have been asked to answer tonight to the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray).

[*English*]

When the hon. member for Windsor West raised the question concerning the admittance of members of the PLO to the Habitat Conference to be held later this year in Vancouver, the Acting Prime Minister replied that, as far as he knew, the Canadian government has never changed its view, which was that we would admit observers from the PLO and other groups, but not known terrorists.

I wish to re-assure the hon. member that the government has not changed its policy in this regard and Bill C-85 reinforces, in fact, the government's position on exclusion of terrorists. It is important to point out that the hon. members agreed to Bill C-85. It passed all stages in this House in one day.

The agreement between Canada and the United Nations with respect to the Habitat Conference authorizes the Secretary General of the United Nations to invite observers from groups such as the Palestinian Liberation Organization. However, we reserve the right to refuse individual members should they be known terrorists.

LABOUR CONDITIONS—REASON FOR REFUSAL TO PERMIT AIR LINE EMPLOYEES TO PROSECUTE AIR CANADA

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, on February 26 I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) to say what criteria he used for withholding of the granting of consent pursuant to section 194 of Part V of the Canada Labour Code to CALEA to prosecute Air Canada and two of its officials. I became suspicious of the minister's proper use of his power when in 1973 he delayed giving his consent under the relevant section when an application was made by CALEA to proceed against Air Canada at that time. The minister witheld his consent until the time limitations of the statute made the consent useless and, needless to say, the counsel for Air Canada, Mr. P. E. Armstrong, was not too happy and on September 25, 1973, he stated, by letter to the president of CALEA, the following:

The application for the minister's consent was filed on May 30, 1973 and, as you will recall, remained in the hands of the minister for a considerable period of time, a formal consent being received in this office on July 27, 1973. It is perhaps more than coincidental that by the time the consent of the minister was received, the time prescribed by the Canada Labour Code for filing a complaint with the board had expired.

In 1976 we find another scenario when CALEA once more sought the minister's consent pursuant to Section 194 to proceed against Air Canada. This time the consent was refused and again we find the counsel for CALEA protesting vigorously.

On December 17, 1975, Mr. MacGregor, counsel for CALEA, sent a telegram to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) in which he clearly outlined the situation with respect to a required consent so that certain employees of Air Canada, and the company itself, could be taken to task for violating Section 184 of the Canada Labour Code because of their actions in interfering with the representation of employees of Air Canada by the Canadian Airline Employees Association. In addition counsel pointed out that Air Canada and the individuals involved had not followed Section 136 of the Canada Labour Code which grants to the Canadian Airline Employees Association, a certified bargaining agent, exclusive authority to bargain collectively on behalf of employees in the bargaining unit.

On January 26, Shirley Carr, Executive Vice-President of the Canada Labour Congress, contacted the Minister of Labour, pointed out that the CLC had reviewed the supporting material supplied with the application for leave to prosecute Air Canada, the manager of Labour Relations, Mr. Norm Radford, and Mr. Dale Akinson, the general manager of Finance Branch. Mrs. Carr pointed out that on the basis of the information available there appeared to be ample ground to grant leave to prosecute. In any event the minister refused his consent and as Mr. MacGregor, the counsel for CALEA points out in a letter written to Mr. Kelly of the minister's department of February 24 of this year, and I quote, in part:

I do not understand your statement that the minister had little alternative but to deny consent to prosecute when our application follows quite clearly Section 8 of the Canada Industrial Relations Regulations. You have shown us in no area that we have been deficient in our particular application—rather you have attempted to convince us to follow one of two alternative remedies open to us under the Canada Labour Code. For obvious reasons which are outlined above we have chosen not to seek a remedy which would have no effect whatsoever upon the corporation or persons complained against but rather we have sought a remedy which would, if we are able to prove our case, provide to the parties involved and to the public clear indication that those sections of the Canada Labour Code shall not be breached or if they are going to be breached they would be breached under fear of penalty by a court of competent jurisdiction.

● (2210)

At the same time, in addition to alleging a violation of section 136 of the Canada Labour Code it would be quite simple for us to allege a violation of section 148 of the Canada Labour Code covering the duty to bargain with a certified bargaining agent. If such were the case, no