

*Air Traffic Control Dispute*

to act in connection with a labour matter. There can be no excuse for further postponement. The bill to be introduced might well be described as the Benson-Pickersgill relief bill to relieve them from the carrying out of their responsibilities. Responsibility for whatever will happen in the event that a strike takes place rests absolutely on the shoulders of the government. That was made clear today. They have played with this, and now they talk of free collective bargaining—free collective bargaining with a shillelagh over the heads of labour and with parliament to be used as a pawn in this game which the government has been playing with the rights of the Canadian people. Could anything be more urgent?

The minister in charge of the Treasury Board says: we are talking now; we are meeting together. Why have they not been meeting all these weeks?

**Mr. Pearson:** We have been meeting.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) can smile with that supercilious sneer of his. He does that on every occasion. It is his responsibility and what he is trying to do now is to place on parliament the responsibility for his own failure.

**An hon. Member:** And that of the government.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** And that of the government. Even he will realize that. An attempt is being made to place on the House of Commons responsibility for becoming an instrument of intimidation to set aside the rightful claims of the workers in this particularly difficult field of the operation of air control.

In the old days, when the question of the urgency of discussion arose, we had the right of appeal from rulings of the Chair. However, we removed that right in order to assure that there would be a degree of justice which would not be challenged. The other day I took a view which was not accepted by Your Honour. I do not complain of that. But I say again that failure to grant the request of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) for an adjournment will mean that the rules are so constricted today that virtually nothing will be urgent enough to permit of the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance.

This is the first time—

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I rise on a point of order. The right hon. gentleman, I suggest, is not [Mr. Diefenbaker.]

arguing the urgency of debate. He is attempting once more to debate the substance of the motion which the hon. member for Ontario has asked leave to introduce, and I suggest once again that the right hon. gentleman contain himself and obey the rules like the rest of us.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I have a great affection for the Minister of Transport. I have a tremendous respect for him. When he rises, there is about him an aura. One almost has to wear coloured glasses to look at him as he speaks with that authority which he invariably vests in himself. I have dealt very gently with him in all I have said. What has annoyed him has been that I have been talking about the head of the Treasury Board.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Now, I come to him on this question of urgency. The hon. gentleman pops up and down on points of order—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order; I invite the right hon. gentleman to return at this point to the question we should be considering, that is, the urgency of debating the motion proposed by the hon. member for Ontario.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The interruption by the minister might very well have received your attention, too.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** If I may say so, with great deference, invariably the hon. gentleman raises these gratuitous observations of his, and Your Honour does not see fit to point out—

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, I regret very much that I cannot agree with the right hon. gentleman. I believe the point raised by the hon. minister was a point of order; I did not consider it to be frivolous in any way. He suggested that members who take part in the debate at this point should restrict themselves to the very limited scope of the discussion, which is whether there is urgency of debate. I believe the point raised by the hon. minister was well taken.

On the other hand, I fully appreciate that it is not easy for anyone taking part in the debate at this stage to limit himself to this very narrow aspect of the subject. I always