

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

### PUBLIC SERVICE

#### RADIO OPERATORS' DISPUTE—BREAKDOWN OF NEGOTIATIONS

**Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provision of Standing Order 26 and ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton), to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing an important and specific matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the withdrawal of services by flight service and coastguard radio operators, caused by the inept efforts of this government which has failed to bargain in good faith with their employees. This accelerating confrontation has caused serious breakdown in safety by removing services to general aviation; by removing services to shipping, including storm warnings and hazards to navigation; by removing important resources which support search and rescue, medical evacuation and emergency response programs; and has caused disruptions in passenger services and the transportation of food and medical supplies and other necessities in remote areas in Canada.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) gave me notice this morning in accordance with the terms of Standing Order 26 of his intention to seek the adjournment of the House pursuant to Standing Order 26 at this time to debate the matter which he has now described, that being the interruption of services by coastguard and radio operators.

The hon. member is probably aware of the reasoning which has traditionally been followed in circumstances of this sort. Strikes, of course, do cause risks and hazards the like of which the hon. member has just described. On the other hand, it is most difficult for the Chair, particularly while negotiations remain active, to consider any such interruption of service or breakdown in discussions or negotiations as constituting a genuine emergency within the terms of Standing Order 26.

● (1540)

I note, for example, in answers to questions in the last few days that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Stevens) has, in one way or another, indicated that attempts are being made to carry on the talks and bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion. In fact, some hearing was to take place I believe today which may require the employees to go back, and therefore negotiations would begin if that were to take place.

During these active stages it would seem to me to be very hazardous for the Chair to accept an application on the subject pursuant to Standing Order 26. Indeed, I think it is risky for the Chair to do so in almost any strike situation, but I do not rule that out forever. At these early stages, however, it would certainly be almost impossible.

Perhaps the hon. member might want to refer, for example, to the language of my very distinguished predecessor as quoted

### Income Tax Act

at page 1540 of *Hansard* dated December 3, 1969, where he said:

There is no doubt in my mind that the relationship between the government and its employees is a matter of particular importance, but I cannot bring myself to feel that the continuing process of bargaining and negotiating is of such immediate urgency as to require the setting aside of the ordinary public business which the House will consider today. In the circumstances the motion proposed by the hon. member should not be put to the House.

That reasoning has been repeated time and time again in strike situations. Again, I say I do not rule it out forever, but certainly at this stage of active consideration, if not active negotiation, which I know is the opinion of the hon. member, but nevertheless active tactic and strategy between the two parties, I think it would be unfortunate for the House to accept his application at this time. Orders of the day.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### INCOME TAX ACT

#### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Friday, November 2, consideration of the motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) that Bill C-17, to amend the statute law relating to income tax and to amend the Canada Pension Plan, be read the third time and do pass.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to speak very long. I will be closing the debate. I presume hon. members know that.

**Mr. Breau:** Not on third reading.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Yes, this is third reading.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. When we last concluded the debate we were resuming debate on the motion for third reading. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie).

**Mr. Crosbie:** Well, I do not know what I am doing, Mr. Speaker. I am just speaking for a few minutes on third reading.

**Mr. Breau:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I take it that since you did not advise the House that he would be closing the debate, such is not the case, although he said he would be closing debate. Could you clarify to the House if the minister will be closing debate by speaking now?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) raises a point that has been raised many times before which concerns the second intervention in any debate by a minister. In this particular case the minister is seeking the floor at the present time. He has not, in fact, spoken before but he did move the third reading motion. It stands in his name, seconded by his colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr.