

that if the hon. member were to bring it forward in a few days if no further developments had taken place the Chair might be favourably disposed to granting the emergency application.

A few days have passed and I awaited notice from the hon. member of his intention to bring forward this application in the present sitting. However, I awaited developments during the question period for two reasons: first, to determine once more the importance of the matter, and it occupied, again, about half today's question period; second, to see whether information elicited during the question period would indicate that there is activity which will give hope for the internal resolution of the conflict. I think I would be an optimist if I were to take the latter interpretation from the facts described during the question period.

The same considerations apply today as I mentioned last Wednesday. It is always difficult to decide these matters. Since parliament has given public servants the right to strike, when the public service exercises that right and inconveniences the public, does that automatically become a matter of emergency? Standing Order 26 does not reflect on one side or the other of a question, but simply provides an opportunity for parliament to address itself to certain issues. Here we are considering a matter which is obviously bringing great inconvenience to the people of Canada and if it were not for the right to strike granted by parliament it would, obviously, in every way be an ideal subject for discussion under this rule.

This being the second application, and substantial activity not having taken place since the first application of five days ago, it seems to me that the Chair ought not to resist further the application for parliament to consider this matter objectively. Certainly, there is nothing pro or con in the motion. It seems to me that if the Chair were to resist the application a second time, it would be making a judgment about the situation that it ought not to make, and interposing itself between the desire of hon. members and the debate.

I might say that this topic was touched on forcibly earlier today. Since parliament has expressed the desire to debate the matter, it seems to me that the Chair ought to grant this application. Accordingly, it would be my intention to see the debate begin at eight o'clock this evening pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 26. I qualify that in this way: it has already been ordered that a vote shall take place at 9.45 this evening on the opposition motion of Friday last. As well, debate is to resume today on the government order relating to *Time and Reader's Digest*. Approximately three hours remain before the time allocation order takes effect which means, presumably, that the second reading vote, all other things being equal, will take place shortly before the supper adjournment which, because of another special order, is to be at 6.30 p.m. and not at six o'clock.

There might be discussions about a convenient way to arrange these two votes without interrupting what will be an important debate which will be scheduled to begin at eight o'clock this evening. If suggestions are to be made, I will be glad to receive them. If not, I will be happy to return to the chair at four o'clock or five o'clock to make an announcement, because I am sure all hon. members will

want to pay close attention to the timing of these two most important votes.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, in view of the situation you have outlined, it might be useful to convene a meeting of House leaders to discuss when these votes may take place. Tentatively, I think they could be held tomorrow and we could arrange a suitable time.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of options open to us. I wonder if we could meet in order to discuss the question of when the votes are likely to be taken and, if necessary, when the debate will commence? I think we could probably discuss this matter and then communicate to Your Honour whatever decision is arrived at.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, there have already been tentative discussions about the two votes. Now that Your Honour has ruled that there is to be a special debate tonight, I agree that it would be a good idea for the House leaders to meet formally and come to a definite decision about the timing of the two votes, the vote on second reading of Bill C-58 and the vote on our motion of last Friday.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask if the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke) has the leave of the House to put the motion which has been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 26, in order that it can be debated at eight o'clock this evening?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

[Translation]

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,115, 3,183, 3,206, 3,212 and 3,299.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Text]

INFORMATION REQUIRED ON ILLEGAL STRIKES

Question No. 3,115—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. By year since 1970 to date, how many illegal strikes have there been in the Public Service?
2. In each case (a) what group was involved (b) what was the duration of the strike (c) how many charges were laid as a result of the strikes?
3. How many of the charges (a) were dropped (b) went to trial and what was the result in each case?
4. In each of the charges that were dropped, what were the reasons for disposing of them in this way?