

Business of the House

Mr. Regan:—assistance is available, if they wish to resume negotiations. Our people are standing by to be of any assistance they can in helping to bring an end to this dispute.

However, I am not aware of the other subject that the hon. member mentions. I certainly have not given authorization for any course of action, nor would I have occasion to do so. It is not a matter which would fall under my jurisdiction in any manner, shape or form. Our job in labour, and I think a job that our people in the Department of Labour carry out very well, is to provide expert mediation services to help avoid and bring to an end disputes of this type. The question of the services which are being maintained is a matter which would fall under another department.

Mr. Nielsen: It certainly wouldn't be a crash course, anyway!

SAFETY OF OPERATIONAL PRACTICES

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Madam Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Labour, if he has not given approval to this crash course for ticket clerks and other clerks to be flight attendants, would he advise the House whether he would investigate the matter and see to it that untrained personnel are not acting as flight attendants on Nordair flights? Would the minister also see to it that this effort of blatant strike-breaking by Nordair will cease immediately?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of Labour): The hon. member will be aware, in relation to the safety of the operational practices, that that is a matter which presently falls under the responsibility of another department and another minister. The hon. member's urgings in that regard could be directed to the Minister of Transport, who says he will look into the matter for the hon. member.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the government House leader the intentions of the government with respect to business next week. Perhaps while he is on his feet he might designate, as far as he could, allotted days.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, next week we will have two opposition days, Monday and Wednesday. Tuesday and Thursday we will continue consideration of Bill C-57 to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Excise Act, with the report stage of the bill beginning on Tuesday.

[English]

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Is the government House leader now in a position to indicate what we will be doing on Friday of next week?

While I am on my feet, I might mention that last week I made an inquiry with respect to the extension of the small business development bond concept to operating capital and inventory and with respect to unincorporated small businesses, which would include farms and, perhaps, fishermen. I asked him if he would consult with the Minister of Finance because of the difficult situation in which people in those occupations find themselves. Has he made that inquiry, and if he has can he inform the House of the results of that inquiry, given the understanding that I tried to direct to him, that we would be prepared to talk about it in terms of a restricted debate?

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: In answer to the hon. member's first question, I would say that next Friday we will be considering bills yet to be decided at the next meeting of House leaders, which is usually held on Wednesday or Thursday. That is why I did not announce the business of the House for next Friday, being well aware that we could be more specific next week depending upon the progress made at the report stage of Bill C-57.

As for his second question, I did discuss the matter with the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussi eres), and I am sure that after he has done the necessary checking he will only be too glad to answer himself any question from the opposition.

[English]

Mr. Knowles: Madam Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the government House leader with respect to House business. I wonder if he could tell me whether my practice of being persistent but polite is going to pay off in terms of getting the legislation respecting veterans, especially with respect to those who were not covered in last summer's Bill C-40, or whether I am going to have to find some other tactic. In other words, what is the reason for such a long delay, since so often I have been told that the matter is going to cabinet in a day or two?

My other question relates to another group of widows. As the minister probably knows, when the present Minister of Justice was president of the treasury board, the government came awfully close to granting legislation which would end the denial of pensions to widows of public servants, RCMP and national defence retirees where the marriage had taken place after retirement. In view of the fact that there are now so many of these later marriages which last for many years and that many widows suffer because of this unfair limitation, will the minister discuss this with the appropriate ministers to see if the proposals of a few years ago can be reactivated?

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's first question, I will say that being polite always pays off, and that is the approach I would recommend he take. If he prefers to try "some other tactic", to use his expression, I must warn him that that could delay the introduction of the legislation he so desperately wants to have passed. If he wants to chance it, I strongly urge him to use manners, because sooner or later that pays off. As for his representations on behalf of the widows of