

*Oral Questions*

Prairies he would find that many of them are empty and have no grain to ship, while others are possibly half full. The Minister said earlier, in terms of cash flow and so on, that he would move at a time when it was prudent. Is the Minister playing politics with the cash flow of farmers, waiting for a prudent time?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I think the question of the Hon. Member once again demonstrates how essential and vital Bill C-155 was, so that we could have in place a new system for allocating and organizing the transportation system.

As far as the second part of the Hon. Member's question is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I continue to exercise my prudence.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### LABOUR RELATIONS

##### TÉLÉ-MÉTROPOLE STRIKE AT MONTREAL—PARTIES' POSITIONS ON APPOINTMENT OF MEDIATOR

**Mr. Jacques Olivier (Longueuil):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour, and as a preamble I would like to stress, with respect to the Leader of the Opposition's attempts at rationalizing my quotes, that there is one which he overlooked, namely that I will never have the opportunity to suggest that the Progressive Conservative party is already dead, because it has never existed and will never exist in Quebec, especially his leadership.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour concerning the Télé-Métropole strike or lockout in Montreal, where workers have for quite a long time been affected by a labour dispute. Some weeks ago, the Minister called upon both parties to state whether they agreed on having a special mediator appointed. Will the Minister now report to the House that both parties are in agreement as to having a special mediator appointed, and if so, when does he expect to appoint one?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I have indeed received a formal request from both parties for the appointment of a special mediator in this dispute. This morning, I informed both parties that Mr. Raymond Leboeuf, from Verdun, had been appointed mediator under Section 195 of the Canadian Labour Code. Hopefully, this development will get both parties closer together and lead to a satisfactory arrangement. I am sure that with the help of Mr. Leboeuf who is an experienced mediator, this long standing dispute should be resolved for the benefit of both parties and the general public without further delay.

● (1440)

#### CORPORATE SHAREHOLDING LIMITATION ACT

##### REASONS FOR GOVERNMENT NOT PROPOSING AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the distinguished Senator for Nickel Belt. Last Friday, the Minister told me that the Canadian Labour Board lacked the authority needed to regulate in the area of interprovincial and international transportation. In view of the statement made yesterday by prominent Quebec businessmen that the Board has all the authority it needed, can the Minister explain exactly what are those essential powers needed by the Board to regulate in the national interest in that area, and why she did not introduce any amendment to the National Transportation Act if the current powers are not adequate?

[English]

**Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that on February 22, 1977, in the case of Pacific Western Airlines, the Supreme Court of Canada, in a unanimous decision, found that Her Majesty in right of the Province is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Canadian Transport Commission. I do not think I have the time now, but I will be very pleased to provide the Hon. Member with the complete written decision which states very clearly that the CTC does not have the power we need in Bill S-31 which we are presenting in the Senate.

[Translation]

##### CONSEQUENCES FOR QUEBEC

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister is very much aware that Quebec's Caisse de dépôt et placements is not an agent of Her Majesty. So that is ridiculous! Despite the statement made by the Minister that all the Members from Quebec support the principle of Bill S-31, the Liberal Member for Longueuil had this to say yesterday, and I quote:

The people of Quebec and the Quebec caucus are against Bill S-31.

Given the opposition from the Quebec Liberal caucus and that of even the unanimous Progressive Conservative caucus from Quebec, how can the Minister insist on reintroducing in the forthcoming session of Parliament that Bill which has stolen millions of dollars from the Quebec taxpayers?

[English]

**Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has made some charges which I think he must substantiate, because this is not a Bill which is robbing millions of dollars from the people of Quebec. Indeed, it protects the investments of millions of Quebecers. I would like to make it very clear that the Bill grandfathers those voting shares owned by the caisse populaire. I would also like to make it very clear that the caisse