

Company of Young Canadians

Considering that two Quebec air traffic controllers were suspended on Monday, December 8, 1975, for carrying out their duties in French, that the Official Languages Act, which Parliament adopted in 1969, grants equal rights and status to the French and English languages within all parliamentary institutions and the government of Canada and, finally, that Section 508 of Air Regulations and Air Navigation Order No. 15, Series V, prohibit the use of French in all air traffic control operations, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Lapointe):

That the question whether Section 508 of Air Regulations and Air Navigation Order No. 15, Series V, violates the Official Languages Act of Canada be referred to the Standing Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments, with instruction to report to the House on or before Friday, December 19, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the hon. member's motion. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

* * *

[English]

COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS**REASON FOR PHASING OUT—ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM—
MOTION UNDER S.O. 43**

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the apparent decision by cabinet to phase out the Company of Young Canadians, and in view of the fact that since its reorganization the company has been doing very positive community development work in isolated and poverty stricken communities, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald):

That the Secretary of State or some other responsible minister explain to the House on motions the reason for this action and what alternative assistance to these communities in need is being contemplated.

Mr. Speaker: 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.

[Mr. Joyal.]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**ANTI-INFLATION BOARD****INQUIRY WHETHER DECISION ON CONTRACT WITH POSTAL
WORKERS COMMUNICATED TO GOVERNMENT—POSSIBILITY
OF FURTHER CONSULTATIONS**

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. I wish to ask the right hon. gentleman whether the Anti-Inflation Board has indicated to the government its view that the contract recently negotiated between the Postmaster General and the inside workers in the post office exceeds the government's anti-inflationary guidelines.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): As I indicated to the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we have some knowledge of the feeling of the Anti-Inflation Board. They have, as is their duty, spoken to the employer side, the government, as well as to the employee side, the union. Therefore, it is fair to say that we know what their thinking is. We discussed a possible response this morning in cabinet, but I called a cabinet meeting for tonight because I am told that, having consulted both sides, they are going to issue a written directive to us, and presumably to the union, to which both sides will have to respond. I am told that we will receive it some time in the course of the afternoon. Cabinet is meeting in the early evening. If we have received this by then and if we can give a written response in time, I will certainly agree to any minister, if the House so desires, making a statement on our response in the House this evening. If not, we will gladly do so tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock.

Mr. Stanfield: I take it from what the Prime Minister says that discussions are no longer continuing between the Anti-Inflation Board and members of the government about the government moderating the contract but rather that the Anti-Inflation Board has made a decision, although the Prime Minister says it has not yet been indicated formally to him. Is that correct?

Mr. Trudeau: Insofar as I know, but I would not want this answer to preclude any further communication. If the Anti-Inflation Board wants to talk with us again we would, of course, be happy to respond. But my understanding is that they have communicated with both sides and are in the process of preparing some statement which will be made public, or communicated to us and to the union.

**POSSIBLE GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO DECISION OF BOARD
ON POSTAL WORKERS' CONTRACT**

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Has the government decided that it will accept the ruling of the Anti-Inflation Board with respect to this contract to which the government is an interested party? Is the government prepared to accept the ruling of this Board established to define and apply the guidelines or does the government reserve the right to take a special position in cases in which it is itself involved in a dispute?