

*Oral Questions*

before this parliament. As to the nature of the consultations, that policy has been laid forth taking into account the new aspects of inflation which, as the hon. gentleman will recognize, have become more severe. I refer to adverse crop conditions in this country and elsewhere and the prolonged resistance of commodity prices in reflecting the downturn in the economy of some of the major countries in the world, added to the quadrupling of oil prices. All this means that inflation is more embedded and its solution will mean a more protracted effort on the part of this country, as well as other countries, than any country had anticipated six months ago.

In this context I am putting the facts forward—as are the Prime Minister and others of my colleagues—to the various components of the economy to see whether we can, on the basis of the policy we are advancing, reach a consensus as to the best way of dealing with the situation.

\* \* \*

**INDUSTRY****UNITED AIRCRAFT—SUGGESTED NATIONALIZATION OF COMPANY—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the right hon. gentleman's agreement last week to consider the proposal put forward on behalf of the New Democratic Party by the hon. member for Winnipeg North, namely, to nationalize the United Aircraft Company whose workers have been on strike for about nine months now, is the Prime Minister in a position today to inform the House what the government intends to do about this important question?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Not today, but I should like to point out that as a matter of principle I shall consider all suggestions put to me seriously by members of the other parties; it is in that spirit I said I would consider the proposition put forward by a member of the hon. gentleman's own party. It would obviously be a mistake to assume that every time I consider a suggestion it will be carried out in practice.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Prime Minister that I am under no illusions about the latter point. Given the government's own activities in the aircraft field, specifically referring to de Havilland in Toronto, given the fact that the conditions provided the workers in that industry in Toronto will remain even better than those at United Aircraft if the workers on strike there have their demands met, and also given the government's development of, and plans for, the STOL industry, which has obvious implications for integrating these two companies, would the Prime Minister give the House the assurance that, whether or not he takes what I regard as the right course of action, by the end of this week he will tell us what the government plans to do one way or the other?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, if I followed the intent of the question correctly, the answer is that I will not accept that particular suggestion. It is not the policy or the

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

practice of the government to attempt to solve labour disputes within provincial jurisdictions by taking over companies.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby may ask a final supplementary.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Just a final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. To clarify the situation for the Prime Minister, I was not suggesting that he solve labour disputes by taking over the industry. I was raising the economic question of integrating two firms, one by the government of Canada and the other by a firm in the United States, in order to fulfil certain economic objectives that the government itself has stated it wants to fulfil.

The question that I am asking the Prime Minister is an economic one. To facilitate that objective of the government, would the government consider taking this course of action so as to carry out its own program?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is repeating very much the substance of the question that I answered the other day. I want to make clear that it should not be inferred from that answer that we will settle labour problems by any form of nationalization.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**SOCIAL SECURITY****GRANTING OF PENSIONS TO WIDOWS AT AGE 60—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare.

A bill will shortly be introduced to grant old age pensions to wives who are 60 years old. I receive many letters from female senior citizens who want to know if those who are widows will be included in the bill granting a pension to all women aged 60 and over.

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, as the minister responsible for the status of women, I should like to point out to the hon. member that this bill does not apply only to the wives, but to any spouse aged between 60 and 65 who needs assistance. The purpose of the bill is clearly stated. This legislation will apply only to the spouse and will obviously not apply in cases where one of the spouses is not yet 65 years old.

**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary.

If one of the spouses is dead, would this mean that the surviving spouse who is 60 years old will not be entitled to the benefit of this new social legislation? If the spouse will not be entitled to this pension, how will she be treated and how can she be respected as a human being?

**Mr. Lalonde:** Mr. Speaker, if the spouse over 65 years old is dead, the survivor is called a widower or a widow and not a spouse and will not be covered by this legislation. In this case, the answer would lie in the guaranteed