

Report on Regulatory Boards and Agencies

● (1410)

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**DATE OF INTRODUCTION OF AMENDING LEGISLATION—
REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION**

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, namely the unacceptable delays in the payments of unemployment insurance benefits. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise):

That this House instruct the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in charge of the Unemployment Insurance Commission to table as soon as possible the new Unemployment Insurance Act, as announced in the Throne Speech, or the candies speech.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the hon. member's motion. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

* * *

[English]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS**REFERENCE OF CANADIAN CONSUMER COUNCIL REPORT ON
REGULATORY BOARDS AND AGENCIES TO STANDING
COMMITTEE—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE
MOTION**

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, notice of the following motion was given to the government House leader well in advance, and he has had time to consider it. I would therefore move, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the report on the Consumer Interest in Regulatory Boards and Agencies by the Canadian Consumer Council, released on April 15th, by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: The motion proposed by the hon. member for St. John's East, and seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity.

[Mr. Speaker.]

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO GRANT ALLOTTED DAY**

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move a motion for the adjournment of the House, for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration and falling within the responsibilities of the government under the heading of supply, as admitted by the President of the Privy Council, namely, the refusal of the government to grant an allotted day within the provisions of Standing Order 58.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has given the Chair the required notice under the provisions of Standing Order 26. This has given the Chair an opportunity to reflect on the important point raised by the hon. member. In passing, may I thank the hon. member for the background documents submitted by instalments to the Chair, which have been found both interesting and intellectually stimulating.

As all hon. members know, Standing Order 58 is the governing order in relation to the matter raised by the hon. member for Peace River and deals, generally speaking, with the businesses of supply and ways and means. Under that Standing Order, at the commencement of each session, there is designated by motion a continuing order of the day. The parliamentary timetable for the consideration of business under Standing Order 56 is divided into three distinct periods. One of these periods terminates not later than December 10, and during that time five sitting days shall be allotted to the business of supply. The second period of the timetable expires not later than March 26 of each year, and during that time a further seven days is allotted. This brings us to the third distinct period, which ends not later than June 30. In each of the periods, and more particularly for the purposes of the current problem, two days may, at the option of members in opposition, be declared to be non-confidence days.

The question the Chair has to determine is whether or not, during the period commencing March 27 and expiring on June 30, that the hon. member refers to as "the refusal of the government to grant an allotted day" is the foundation for an adjournment debate under Standing Order 26. The requirements of Standing Order 26 are well known to all hon. members. Section 5 of the Standing Order states that in determining whether a matter should have urgent consideration Mr. Speaker "shall have regard to the extent to which it concerns the administrative responsibilities of the government or could come within the scope of ministerial action—"

Precedents extending over a long period of time indicate that these words always have been interpreted as referring to a sudden emergency requiring immediate ministerial intervention. The Standing Order has never been interpreted as applying to the operation of other Standing Orders. In this particular instance, the hon. member's proposed motion seeks precisely to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing the operation of Standing Order