

Order of Business

which time I would be prepared to indicate my preference if no other member indicates his.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Because of the bumbling of the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Goodale) we are faced with this dilemma.

I have a notice of motion No. 27 on the order paper. We have not yet run out of business important to the people of Canada. The motion in my name asks the government to consider the establishment of a mining act for the protection of miners. If that is not of concern to the people of Canada, I do not know what is. How can the Postmaster General (Mr. Blais) suggest adjournment of the House when we have important business such as notice of motion No. 27 regarding the safety of workers? We can very well debate it. I think the government has bungled House of Commons business in the last three days miserably, and now it wants to adjourn the House. It is absolutely shameful for it to want to adjourn the House.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): And we will not let them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): There has been a suggestion that we proceed to motion No. 27. Is that agreed?

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, we seem to have lost that note of cordiality which I referred to earlier which tends to be the hallmark of this hour. I think we should go through the normal process of calling out the items of business on the order paper. I do not think we have any other alternative at this stage but to follow the normal process.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Since we do not have unanimous consent to proceed to notice of motion No. 27, we will consider the motions one by one. The first notice of motion is No. 16 in the name of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin).

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He is not here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is there agreement to debate the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Blais: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the sponsor of the motion must be present in the House to move a motion. The hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) is not here, so we cannot proceed with the motion, and I propose that it be struck.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I rise on the same point of order. I would be prepared to move the motion in the name of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) so that we could proceed with the debate on it. That is quite in order, and in accordance with the rules.

Mr. Blais: Not unless the mover of the motion consents.

[Mr. Peters.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The motion is stood at the request of the government.

● (1610)

Notice of motion No. 17 in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander). Is there unanimous consent to proceed with motion No. 17 in the absence of its mover?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: no.

Motion No. 17 stood at the request of the government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Notice of motion No. 26 in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

Some hon. Members: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The motion stands at the request of the government.

* * *

MERCHANT MARINE**SUGGESTION TO REVIVE**

The House resumed, from Monday, December 6, 1976, consideration of the motion of Mr. Guay (Lévis):

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of reviving the Canadian Merchant Marine and applying recommendations of the Darling Report.

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to deal with this particular motion. There has been some debate on this motion, and the interest of the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) is a very serious and worthwhile one. As hon. members very well know, my riding is not adjacent to any of the oceans which surround the country. I am left at somewhat of a disadvantage. I therefore move:

That the debate on motion No. 3 be now adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE**TASK FORCE TO REVIEW PUBLIC SERVICE ACT**

The House resumed, from Monday, December 13, 1976, consideration of the motion of Mr. Herbert:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of establishing a special task force to review the Public Service Employment Act and the role of the Commission in personnel management and employer-employee relations in the Public Service and that the review include an examination of the role assigned the Public Service Commission and its relation-