

*Unemployment Conditions*

**Mr. Fulton:** Attempted to but unsuccessfully.

**Mr. Speaker:**—item 615. However, if the house desires a debate on this issue at an appointed time and is prepared to give unanimous consent—which it would have to do—that the matter be set for Friday, and that it be agreed that the item, when it is considered in committee, be considered broad enough to cover the unemployment situation generally, that would avoid my dealing with the other issue.

**Mr. Regier:** May I have—

**Mr. Speaker:** It is a question of whether there is unanimous consent. Is that the proposal which the Prime Minister wishes to make to the house, the one which I have just put forward?

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Winch:** Why not do it now, then?

**Mr. Argue:** Mr. Speaker, there is a question of clarification. As I understood the proposal of the Prime Minister it was that under the item, winter works program, we could debate the general question of unemployment. I may be mistaken, but I do not believe that carried with it the suggestion it should be a debate of fixed duration rather than a debate such as we could ordinarily have on this item, though we could have a broader discussion of the question of unemployment in this country. When the item for the winter works program passes, then the general debate is over.

**Mr. Speaker:** That, as I understood it, is the proposal; that it be called on Friday.

**Hon. L. B. Pearson (Leader of the Opposition):** If the urgency of this matter is such that the Prime Minister is willing to recommend that unanimous consent be given to the alteration of the rules to enable it to be discussed on Friday, surely that urgency is such that it should be discussed today.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not want to take time unnecessarily in sounding out the house as to whether there is agreement to this proposal. If there is not, I shall proceed to deal with the proposed motion.

**Mr. Martin (Timmins):** There is a point of order I want to raise. In what position are members who have already spoken to this item and have been limited to the narrow point?

**Mr. Graffey:** Read the rules.

**Hon. Howard C. Green (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** This so-called urgency of debate is based on certain figures which have been made public today. The same type of

figures are made available at certain stated periods, certainly at no greater interval than every month. I do suggest that because the statement happens to come out today, this does not enable members of the opposition to move a motion to adjourn the house based on those figures.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Why not?

**Mr. Green:** If that were the case, then they could do the same thing every month. This particular rule was never designed to meet a situation of this kind. The real situation is that there is great urgency on the part of members of the opposition to make big speeches. I am not imputing motives; I am just stating the facts. There have been many days already made available to members of the opposition parties for discussion of this very question. They have taken full advantage of these opportunities. There will be an opportunity for them on Friday. Then there is to be a motion to go into supply on Monday. If they have the courage to introduce an amendment dealing with this question on Monday, then they can have a debate.

However, I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this rule was never designed to enable opposition parties to pick up statistics which are issued regularly once a month, or at stated periods, and on them base a motion to adjourn the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before I deal with that, is the house prepared to make an order along the lines suggested by the Prime Minister; that is, that the debate on unemployment generally take place on the calling of the supplementary item for the Department of Labour, which will be called on Friday? If there is any disagreement I shall deal with the proposed motion.

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** It depends on your interpretation, Mr. Speaker. This motion is one of urgency. Mention has been made of unemployment, and if it is a discussion on unemployment then that cannot be had on Friday. The urgency results from a situation which is developing and has developed at Elliot Lake, in the maritimes and in Vancouver. There is definite urgency, and on that basis we want a discussion.

**Mr. Robichaud:** Just on the point of order—

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not know how many points of order are possible. I simply want to know whether the house wishes to accept the opportunity, by unanimous agreement, to debate this question on Friday in lieu of this motion, or to have me deal with it as it should be dealt with.