

that the Prime Minister is not able to see the injustice of this situation. I ask the Prime Minister how employees or groups of employees are to proceed if they consider the ruling of the Anti-Inflation Board unjust but do not wish to defy the ruling of the board? How is it possible, under present proceedings, to be in a position to appeal the ruling of the board, without putting oneself in the position of breaking the law, defying the board and being subject to criminal law sanctions?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the persons who would break the law would be only those who are breaking it after the administrator has issued an order. The Leader of the Opposition shakes his head. I do not hear what he is thinking, but I should like him to state how he believes people are breaking the law just because they are not listening to the Anti-Inflation Board.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am reluctant to interfere with this line of questioning, but it seems to me we are entering two dangerous areas: One, the interpretation of the statute and, the other, the hypothetical area as to what would happen if such and such a thing were to happen. I do not like to confine this. I shall recognize the Leader of the Opposition for a final supplementary question at this stage.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I hope others will pursue this question beyond my final supplementary question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Let me ask the Prime Minister simply if he believes it proper that a party to a collective agreement should be able to appeal the ruling of the Anti-Inflation Board without having to defy the board, without having to indicate that it does not intend to comply with the ruling of the board; should a party be able to do that before getting access to the administrator? Is it commensurate with our ordinary considerations of administration and justice in this country that one cannot bring an appeal unless one is prepared to defy the board, or indicate defiance of the board.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, having read *Hansard* of the day before yesterday, it seems to me that the Minister of Finance dealt with that in indicating that people who are appealing the ruling of the board, to use the words of the Leader of the Opposition, are those who disagree with the ruling of the AIB. This seems to me to be the normal course of procedure. I am just saying that I do not call that an appeal. I am saying that we are really changing the nature of the operation at that point. The Anti-Inflation Board is not a court of justice; nor is it even a quasi-judicial board. But the administrator is, and therefore an appeal lies from his orders to the appeal tribunal.

GOVERNMENT INTENTIONS WITH REGARD TO APPEAL PROCEDURE

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister? I find it difficult to believe that a civil libertarian, as he is, does not understand the injustice of the situation.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Oral Questions

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister not understand that particular aspect of law? Does it not appear unusual and alarming to the Prime Minister that the situation the Leader of the Opposition has described for two days to the Prime Minister has given rise in this country to an inflammatory situation? Given those facts, which must be apparent to the Prime Minister, what does the Prime Minister intend to do about them in terms of his own program?

An hon. Member: Arrange to have you deflated.

● (1420)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is jawboning, but I cannot give a different answer to him than I gave to the Leader of the Opposition.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ALLEGED THREAT OF CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS TO WITHDRAW REPRESENTATIVES FROM GOVERNMENT BODIES

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to follow up the general line of questioning to the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware of plans by the Canadian Labour Congress to withdraw its representatives from all government advisory bodies, including the minister's own council on collective bargaining, and what steps is the minister taking to head off this further dangerous polarization within this country?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member is doing a service to either the Canadian Labour Congress or this parliament by misrepresenting what the Canadian Labour Congress said.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): The Canadian Labour Congress did not say they were withdrawing. They said they were reviewing the position with respect to these boards. There is quite a difference.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The minister is quite correct. There is indeed quite a difference. Does the minister not see the potential for inflammation of a very serious situation in this country that is now being aided and abetted by the Minister of Labour and the Prime Minister who is stonewalling with respect to natural justice in so far as this question is concerned?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, it seems that by his unintentional misrepresentation the hon. member is contributing more to an inflammatory situation than anything I have ever seen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Now we are being hit by the jawbone of the minister.