

*Labour Conditions***MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26**

[English]

LABOUR CONDITIONS**IRVING PULP AND PAPER—CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS
REACTION TO DECISION OF ANTI-INFLATION BOARD
ADMINISTRATOR**

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes), the adjournment of the House, under the provisions of Standing Order 26, for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the revelation today of the announced intention by the executive of the Canadian Labour Congress representing almost two million Canadian workers to withdraw from all areas of co-operation with the federal government in every province, this decision arising from the now clearly demonstrated and acknowledged absence of the right of appeal under due process of law for all those affected by decisions of the Anti-Inflation Board and/or the administrator, and leading inevitably to further breakdown of civil order in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), pursuant to Standing Order 26, has given the Chair notice of his intention to put before the House the motion which he has described to the House. The Chair has had the matter under consideration for the two previous days of this sitting and on other days, as will be shown in the records of the House. In applications pursuant to Standing Order 26, the Chair has to make a basic decision, and that is whether the matter is one that is proper to be discussed pursuant to the provisions of the Standing Order; that is to say, is it a specific matter of importance, requiring urgent consideration?

Previous motions have made reference to the necessity for amendment of the anti-inflation legislation in order to cure certain alleged shortcomings. I have taken the position that such amendments ought to be sought in other ways. I have no reason to alter my thinking in that regard. Even in those rulings, however, I went to some length to indicate that there was general agreement of the House that the matter was of considerable importance; that it was of considerable scope. Indeed, it had been raised on both sides of the House by way of applications pursuant to this rule and by way of questions. In fact, in the last few days it has been the subject of questions by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and by members of other parties throughout the question period. It has been the subject of questions to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as well as to other members of the cabinet.

There was a problem at one time with the question of jurisdiction. That question has now been set aside. I indicated in previous rulings that there were many ingredients that made this an ideal subject for discussion pursuant to the Standing Order, except that it relates to the amendment of a statute which was passed by this House very recently and I thought, therefore, it ought not to be, in that form, the subject of discussion pursuant to Standing Order 26. The motion put forward by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby in this instance, however,

[Mr. Speaker.]

refers principally to a different ingredient, or a different development altogether, and that is—and I quote:

—the revelation today of the announced intention by the executive of the Canadian Labour Congress representing almost two million Canadian workers to withdraw from all areas of co-operation with the federal government in every province—

The hon. member has also added some words about the basis for that decision. May I express the opinion that the opinion that the basis for the decision is not the guiding factor in this particular instance as far as the Chair is concerned, except that it does relate to the anti-inflation measures that are before the House in one way or another and, which therefore clearly ties it into the jurisdiction of this House. Surely, if such an act on the part of the Canadian Labour Congress is contemplated and is announced publicly by them, as is alleged in the notice of motion, it is not for the Chair to make an independent determination as to the truth of that but, rather, to accept it at its face value. Surely, therefore, the matter is both important and urgent.

Secondly, having considered that the matter is important and requires urgent consideration, I think it ought to be said very clearly that it is not in the interests of this House or the interests of the country to await the actual event before extending to hon. members of this House the opportunity to express themselves—that is to say, members on both sides of the House and at every level—in advance of any further deliberations of such a serious move within the Canadian Labour Congress and in advance of any consultations which may take place between that important congress and this government.

Therefore, I feel that this subject is a proper one to be discussed pursuant to Standing Order 26. If the hon. member has leave of the House to put the motion, it would be my disposition that it be considered by the House at eight o'clock this evening.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to the terms of Standing Order 26, I must therefore ask whether the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has leave of the House to put his motion at eight o'clock this evening.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed and so ordered.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I am rising now on a point of order which arises from a decision Your Honour reached in today's proceedings not to accept a question I put to the Prime Minister concerning certain aspects of the anti-inflation law. At that time Your Honour said it was your view that what was involved in the question was an interpretation of law. With all due respect to Your Honour, I should like to suggest that that was not the case. Earlier in the question period I had asked the Prime Minister a