

## Oral Questions

● (1410)

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR RETURN TO KETTLE POINT BAND OF LAND  
EXPROPRIATED BY DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE—  
MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to propose a motion arising from an urgent matter. In view of the fact that the Department of National Defence has refused to return certain lands expropriated under the terms of the War Measures Act from the Kettle Point Indian Band because of the presence of accumulated live artillery shells on that land, and in view of the fact that in less than two hours' time the department will start firing more artillery on the land, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow):

That this House order the Department of National Defence to stop these planned manoeuvres, and further that this House direct the department to remove all unexploded ammunition from the land and return it to its original owners.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House for the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

## THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON  
EXISTENCE OF EMERGENCY

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. I should like to ask him a fundamental question that must be answered in light of the government's white paper and the postal strike. I do not think there can be any real doubt about the government's position but I should like to make absolutely certain. At the first ministers' conference in April of this year the former Minister of Finance stated that "the imposition of direct controls by the government over prices and incomes . . . would not be acceptable to the people . . . except in conditions of real emergency". I assume there is no question about this, but is it the government's position that conditions of real emergency do exist now?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, the legislation now before the House rests, in part at least, upon the peace, order and good government clause in the constitution, and therefore in that sense there is an emergency.

**Mr. Stanfield:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the Acting Prime Minister's position that there is a

[Mr. Speaker.]

real emergency? So there is no doubt about it, is that the position of the government? Secondly, is it the position of the government, in considering the postal strike, that this also constitutes an emergency situation?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, the particular emergency that underlies, at least in part, the legislation now before the House relates to the situation that has arisen out of inflation. There can, of course, be serious problems arising out of a postal strike, but it is not in that sense that there is an emergency.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—EFFECT OF WAGE GUIDELINES  
ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If there is an emergency with regard to inflation but there is no emergency with regard to the post office, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister a question arising out of the position that he took yesterday. The minister said that he could not hold out any hope that a post office strike would not harm many individuals, but he said that this is one of the penalties of collective bargaining. Is it the government's position that collective bargaining has not already been very narrowly circumscribed, at least in dollars and cents terms, as of midnight, October 13?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is this, that collective bargaining can proceed. If, however, after a reference to the Anti-Inflation Board it is found that the settlement exceeds the guidelines, then, of course, various actions may take place. But this does not in itself interfere with collective bargaining.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** You cannot suck and blow at the same time.

**Mr. Sharp:** Perhaps I can explain the situation in this way. My colleague the Postmaster General has offered to the inside workers the proposal that was accepted by a very high proportion of the letter carriers. That, we hope, will be within the guidelines as administered by the Anti-Inflation Board. My colleague does not feel at all inhibited in carrying on his negotiations by reasons of these guidelines. We believe the offer is well within them; but this is not a judgment that politicians will make, it is a judgment that will be made by an independent board.

\* \* \*

## POST OFFICE

STRIKE OF INSIDE WORKERS—WILLINGNESS OF  
GOVERNMENT TO NEGOTIATE FRINGE BENEFITS

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Postmaster General. We are pleased to see the hon. gentleman back in the House today.

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