

Inquiries of the Ministry

least January 7. I think an opportunity must be provided for the government to outline its proposals to provide alternate employment to the people affected. I believe also that an immediate opportunity must be offered to hon. members to make suggestions as to solutions to this problem.

I know Your Honour made certain remarks in ruling on an adjournment motion the other day. Without referring specifically to any one of those remarks, because I do not want to get into an argument with Your Honour, anticipating that some of them may be considered applicable to the current situation may I simply say in broad, general terms, that none of the reasons given then are applicable in this situation.

My first reason for saying this is that it does not require legislation to correct this situation; it requires just a policy decision and declaration by the government. Second, the matter is of such urgency that it cannot wait, because the employment of 1,000 or more people is involved and many of them are unable to qualify for unemployment insurance. Therefore something must be done immediately and the matter cannot wait for the 17 days, I believe it is, before the next supply motion is called.

With respect to the reference made by Your Honour to a similar motion by the then hon. member for Laurier, this dealt with a matter of a different and broader nature, and I submit it is not applicable to this situation.

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief in my remarks because my colleague has covered the points involved in this question. I should simply like to underscore the fact that this is an immediate problem which has immediate effects upon a large group of people who, as the hon. member pointed out, do not have unemployment insurance available to them. Also there is no early opportunity to discuss this matter in the house other than under the rule which the hon. member for Skeena is asking to be invoked today.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the importance and urgency of the matter which has been brought to the attention of the house by the hon. member for Skeena and the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond. But as the house knows very well the question before us is not whether the matter is urgent, which I am sure is recognized by all, but whether there should be a motion to adjourn this house for the purpose of permitting a debate or consideration in the house this afternoon of the

[Mr. Howard.]

matter raised by the hon. member for Skeena.

● (2:50 p.m.)

I suggest that leave to propose this type of motion should be granted only in very extreme circumstances. The hon. member for Skeena has referred to the fact that leave to move a motion, perhaps to discuss a matter of a similar nature, was requested earlier this week by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. On that occasion leave was refused by the Chair. The hon. member for Skeena suggests that none of the reasons advanced by the Chair on that day apply today. I cannot agree with him, and I suggest that the two situations are basically the same. Certainly the fact that we were dealing with C.N.R. employees in the previous case would not apply here, but the other considerations were relevant to the present situation and the decision which applied then should also apply today.

I should suggest to the hon. member that what he has now advanced is more in the nature of a grievance and should not be the subject of a motion for adjournment under standing order 26. I would refer the hon. gentleman to citation 100 (8) of Beauchesne's fourth edition, the last words of which, read as follows:

...because, if that was so, we might have repeated motions made by the opposition of the day, not so much in the direction of censuring the government for action which had been taken or not taken, for bringing to notice some grievance demanding instant remedy, as in the direction of wishing to introduce legislation on some particular subject.

I bring to the attention of the hon. member particularly the reference made therein to the suggestion that this is in the nature of grievance.

For this reason I would think it is not possible for the Chair to grant leave to propose a motion to adjourn as requested by the hon. member.

LABOUR CONDITIONS**MEASURES TO DEAL WITH REPORTED INCREASE IN UNEMPLOYMENT**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. I thought I saw the Minister of Labour in his seat some time