

Air Traffic Control Dispute

Mr. Graftey: Mr. Speaker, the urgency of debate is this. We always deal with one situation, but this is not just one situation. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson) frankly admitted to us that not a week has gone by during his tenure of office when there has not been a strike. This kind of thing is going on every single week. The people of Canada want us to deal not with just the air strike but with the whole fumbling and bumbling of this government in terms of the overall problem.

If this matter of urgency is not recognized by the Chair, we will be faced with a *fait accompli* by a government which is to bring in legislation in this regard. As a member of Her Majesty's official opposition, I do not wish to have any part in the triumph of the right wing of that dinosaur cabinet. The kind of legislation which the minister wants to bring in, and which I want to avoid, is nothing more nor less than a triumph of the bureaucratic right wing of the cabinet. I want a debate here this afternoon in order to avoid that kind of legislation which will only hurt management-labour relations. I want to hear what the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) will have to say in this regard. We all wish to hear from this great friend of the labour movement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the impression the hon. member now is making the speech which he might have the opportunity to make if the motion is granted. I cannot think of any other speech he might make except this one. I do feel he is going beyond what I thought was the limited scope of the discussion at this point.

Mr. Graftey: May I summarize very briefly Mr. Speaker. In order to avoid the kind of legislation which I think will be harmful to any future situation of this type, I think we should have a debate this afternoon. I do not wish to be faced in 48 hours with a *fait accompli* and be a participant in the triumph of the right wing of the Liberal government.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make two or three points on this matter of the urgency of debate. May I respectfully point out to Your Honour your ruling of yesterday afternoon.

● (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I might mention to hon. members that this was done in the course of the afternoon.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Lambert: With the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with referring to it again because it leads up to the remarks made by the Minister of Transport. Yesterday, the hon. gentleman said the vote had not been taken, and therefore it was presumptuous to decide anything on the basis of what might happen. Now, the Minister of Transport says there is to appear on the order paper, and notice is being given, a proposal to deal with this matter. However, with the greatest respect Mr. Speaker that settles nothing. Certainly, it should not be deemed that this debate would anticipate something that is already on the order paper. This is in the nature of a definite confession if it is deemed to be a reason this debate should not take place.

In any event, the question of opportunity of debate must always remain foremost in Your Honour's mind. There are no estimates left. There is no indication that the government is going to call this item of business. There is no indication that this house will sit extended hours on Friday or Saturday. There is no certainty about that; nothing has been decided by the house. It is not what the government decides that determines whether this house shall hold a debate. It is this house that decides whether there will be a debate, subject of course to Your Honour's approval. The decision is not based on the fact further negotiations are taking place, as the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Benson) or the Minister of Transport indicated, because negotiations could continue until 0755 hours on Monday morning and at eight o'clock these people could be on strike. It is the strike that we want to prevent. There is the further principle that this house must debate, the question of participation by public servants in a strike, with parliament, the final arbiter, as one of the parties—because that is what it is.

The situation may be novel because this is one of the few times we have been faced with a direct strike by public servants, involving parliament and the government of Canada. We should not be precluded from discussing the matter, under the circumstances, even though the hour is late. In the light of what was said yesterday, I submit that Your Honour has no alternative but to allow the motion today.

Mr. Speaker: I know that a number of hon. members want to take part in the debate, and I do not want to cut off the debate on the point of order. However, there is just about an hour and a half left this afternoon, and even