

*S. O. 52**[English]*

Mr. Speaker: I should advise the House that I have received several applications for emergency debates. I will hear first the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan (Mr. Angus).

* * *

MOTIONS TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 52

AVIATION SAFETY IN CANADA

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, on March 17 I wrote to you requesting two things. The first was an immediate recall of Parliament which you declined, according to the rules within which you had to work. Second, I indicated that at the first opportunity I would be rising under the provisions of Standing Order 52 to seek leave to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing aviation safety in Canada.

I think it was clear at that time, and since March 17 as well, that there is great concern over aviation safety in this country. A number of circumstances, including the very unfortunate crash at Dryden, Ontario, have left the public of Canada uncertain about safety in the air.

I urge you, Sir, to set aside an appropriate time so that we can have a full and helpful debate in this House.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could take my comments into consideration as well for the application that I have made for an emergency debate in an effort to save the time of the House.

I believe there is a crisis in the area of air safety at the present time in our country. There was a most tragic air crash in Canada on December 12, 1985, in Gander, Newfoundland. Since then the Canadian Aviation Safety Board has conducted an investigation into this, the worst air disaster in the history of our country. This particular inquiry has been divisive, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of questioning the competence of the Aviation Safety Board investigators, but I must still point out that there was a great deal of controversy. . .

[English]

Over recent months the congestion at airports, the shortage of air traffic controllers, the judicial inquiry into the Gander air crash, and the judge acting as a consultant to review the Gander air crash, warrant two things I respectively submit. First, that you consider granting us an emergency debate. Second, I believe we should be hearing as well the resignation of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard).

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Members have brought a matter to the attention of the Chair which is, of course, an important one. I know that they would both understand that I would want to reserve, at least for a little while, and consider the applications that have been made.

I have also an application from the Hon. Member for Lambton—Middlesex (Mr. Ferguson).

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD—JURISDICTION RESPECTING OATS

Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 52, I ask leave to propose a motion to adjourn the House for the purpose of a debate on a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration.

In view of the fact that the Minister for Grains and Oilseeds (Mr. Mayer) has deprived Parliament of our traditional right to debate and has not consulted with Canadian farmers before removing oats from the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, we respectfully request that you allow an emergency debate in the House of Commons on this issue.

It is of the utmost importance that the Government of Canada stand by and support our Canadian producers and their marketing systems during this prolonged period of economic instability, and particularly at a time when oats have gained recognition as a human health food. To have removed this product from the jurisdiction of the most sophisticated marketing system in the world without consultation—

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the Hon. Member will understand that the custom is to make the point to the Speaker but not enter into a debate. There is fairness in this. Obviously those on the other side of the particular argument will then feel that they have not had a chance to put their argument to the Speaker. These applications for emergency debates are not treated that way. The Chair hears one side and one side only. It is in the form and legal terms of an ex parte application. I know the Hon. Member will understand that. I have the Hon. Member's point and I will again reserve and consider it.