

*Oral Questions*

move, seconded by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski):

That the federal government move immediately to settle the question of feed freight assistance and to ensure equity between feed freight rates on grain and animals.

A balance in feed freight rates between grain and meat would ensure the development of agriculture according to natural advantages.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS**

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF FREIGHT OPERATIONS IN NEWFOUNDLAND—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion under Standing Order 43. Widespread concern by Newfoundland railway employees makes suspect the CNR's intentions with regard to the future of rail freight in the province. Evidence indicates a downgrading of rail movements in favour of road transport, which taxes the present low-standard trans-Canada highway and is contrary to government thrusts in conservation and economic considerations. In order to remove the danger of a repeat of the elimination of rail passenger service in the province, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House orders that the Canadian Transport Commission investigate the CNR freight operation in Newfoundland with a view to determining the future intentions of CNR as it concerns rail freight operations.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**THE CANADIAN ECONOMY**

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—EFFECT ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING—SUGGESTED STATEMENT BY BOARD OF WAGE INCREASE PERMITTED RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. It arises out of the pretence of himself and many of his colleagues that the government's controls policy does not restrict the scope of collective bargaining. What posi-

[Mr. Murta.]

tion will he take now that the Prime Minister has admitted on national television that that program does substantially restrict the scope of collective bargaining; and in particular, will the government now have the courage to do its duty and arrange, after proper hearings, for the Anti-Inflation Board to indicate to the parties to the railway dispute exactly what is the maximum settlement that is acceptable to the board and the government?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the statement referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. It is true, of course, that the Anti-Inflation Board can affect agreements that have been entered into voluntarily. That has always been the case and, so far as I know, there is no intention of changing the procedures or the scope or the methods of the Anti-Inflation Board at the present time.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder when my hon. friend, whom I try hard to respect from day to day—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Stanfield:** —will stop pretending that a program designed to, among other things, restrict the scope of wage settlements does not restrict collective bargaining? In view of this, and in view of the important and possibly disastrous effect a railway strike could have, why does the government insist on following this farce through to the end rather than exercising the very substantial powers and responsibilities it recently sought and received from parliament?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I shall miss the hon. gentleman when he is no longer in the position he is at the present time. I should like to thank him for the co-operation and respect he has shown me, at least in the past. On the particular question he has raised, we have debated this on many occasions. The position of the government is that collective bargaining should proceed and then the Anti-Inflation Board should make a judgment on the outcome.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the fair-minded Acting Prime Minister whether he will not agree that the present position being taken by the government in respect of wage settlements, and the pretense that free collective bargaining is being preserved and the government will not restrict this, is just as hypocritical as the attitude it previously took toward wage and price controls in general?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, since I want to be perfectly frank and honest with my hon. friend, the answer is no.

\* \* \*

**LABOUR CONDITIONS**

THREATENED STRIKE OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES—SUGGESTION ANTI-INFLATION BOARD SET OUT PARAMETERS OF NEGOTIATION

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Labour. Since the public demands of the railway union which resulted in a