

member for Vancouver Quadra, who is not in the House today, he might wish to rise on one of those, and he would not know on which one to rise. I suggest to the Chair that at least the name of the hon. member in whose name the motion stands should be cited seriatim as we go down the list. I am not suggesting it is necessary to read the whole motion but at least to repeat the hon. member's name so that I and other members can follow the list of the motions seriatim.

[Translation]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, with due respect, I do not want to make the decision for you but I merely wish to comment on the point raised by my colleague. I believe it would be easy to correct the situation. I know he has no intention of taking the government by surprise and asking the member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke) on Monday or Friday or any other day to move his motion for concurrence of the committee's report and thus bring about a debate. As a result of our talks I understood that the government would be given advance notice, and if that was the case his point of order is irrelevant. You would be given advance notice, Madam Speaker, so that the member for Vancouver Quadra could rise and move the appropriate motion concerning one of the four reports on the Order Paper. So unless it is my colleague's intention to play a trick on the government and take it by surprise, I fail to see how his point of order could be relevant in the circumstances.

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, the intervention by the government House leader did not deal at all with the point I raised. I am simply suggesting very respectfully to the Chair that the proper practice—it has always been so in the past—is for the Chair to call each of the items in order. In the last couple of days I have noticed that they have been lumped. I do not like to see our getting into loose practices, and I believe they should be called in order.

As far as the comments of the government House leader with respect to tricking the government are concerned, I have been sitting here and taking lessons from him since he has been sitting in the House, and I consider him the expert in the trickery department.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: As far as I can recall, it would certainly not be the first time that I called a motion in the name of a member, knowing full well that there were three or four motions under that member's name. They have already been grouped. This is a practice I follow almost automatically when motions start to accumulate under a member's name. However, when I call a member's motion, he is perfectly free to say he would like to discuss this or that motion. He may rise and I could then give him the floor. I have no objection to calling the member for Vancouver Quadra four times in succession, if that is the wish of the House, but I felt that having called on the member for Vancouver Quadra, he was perfectly free to

say at that time: "Yes, as a matter of fact, I would like to discuss such and such motions listed under my name". I can do that, however, and if he insists, I will!

Order Paper Questions

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

[English]

FORESTRY

UNEMPLOYMENT IN FOREST INDUSTRY

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Madam Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Kristiansen), to move the adjournment of the House under the provisions of Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent attention, namely, skyrocketing unemployment in Canada's forest industry, which has neared the 18 per cent mark and shows no signs of abating, and the shutdowns and lay-offs in the forest industry that are the result of current economic policy, which means disaster for the communities that depend on the forest industry for their livelihood.

Madam Speaker: The hon. member gave me notice of his intention to seek the adjournment of the House to discuss the matter of the high unemployment situation in Canada's forest industry. I must remind the hon. member that applications for debate in similar situations have been made in the past, and in this regard I want to quote one of my predecessor's statements which I extract from *Hansard* for February 13, 1978 at pages 2786 and 2787. He said, and I quote:

In terms of individual communities and industries, the Chair has often been in a difficult position when attempting to adjudicate upon these matters because the terms of the Standing Order, as such, are to give leave or an opportunity to hon. members to bring matters of a crisis nature before the House which would not otherwise come before the House. Yet, it is not envisaged that that rule ought to be used to bring what are considered crises from individual constituencies or industries before the House.

In addition, as I said on October 14 last, economic problems are of a continuing nature and do not justify the allowance of debate of an emergency nature. The hon. member is no doubt aware that there are four allotted days remaining in the current supply period. I am sure there will be those opportunities and many others for him to bring this important matter before the House. Therefore, I regret that I cannot comply with the hon. member's application.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 2,411, 2,612, 2,706 and 2,803.