

Amchitka Nuclear Test

er requiring any hon. member who objects to rise in his place and say so—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Howard (Skeena):—so there will be no question of doubt and so the record will be clear that there was a negative response and from whom it came.

Mr. Speaker: The point made by the hon. member is one of great interest. As he knows, the Chair is required to interpret the rules as they are drafted. If the rules are drafted in such a way as to indicate that an hon. member objecting to such a motion should rise and express his negative opinion, then, of course, the Chair would expect this to be done, but as long as the Standing Order is drafted in its present terms I think it should be sufficient for the Chair to hear negative response. I am not sure what the requirements are for a good Speaker, but I gather that among the more basic ones are that the Speaker should have good eyesight and good hearing.

Mr. Jerome: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, as one who has frequently been known to negative as loudly as possible motions put forward under Standing Order 43, simply in order that we may get on with important government business, may I say I found unanimous accord with the motion expressed on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Obviously the hon. member will never be a Speaker. His hearing is not good enough.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member who has just spoken, sitting as he does among the government benches, is at all right in his statement, perhaps Your Honour would consider asking again whether there is unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure it would be very helpful if every day the Chair were asked to put the request for consent to a motion a second time. The request has been put and in my estimation it was negated. It may be that, on reflection, some hon. members who said "no" feel they would not be prepared to say "no" again. I would be prepared to put the request a second time if there were unanimous consent that I be allowed to do so. I draw to the attention of hon. members that a motion having been put and decided by the Chair it cannot be put a second time unless there is unanimous agreement.

Is there unanimous agreement that the motion proposed by the hon. member for Skeena be put at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there may be unanimous agreement.

Mr. McIntosh: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, once a motion has been put I think we should abide by the rules of the House. I said no and I suggest the motion should therefore not be put.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's point is well taken. This is what I feared. The motion was put and was negated, and unless there is unanimous consent it should not be put a second time.

[Mr. Howard (Skeena.)]

[Translation]

ASSISTANCE IN RETURNING BODIES OF ACCIDENT VICTIMS FROM SPAIN—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, under Standing Order 43, to present a motion of extreme urgency.

My motion refers to the tragedy that occurred last Friday, September 17, at Valdepenas, Spain, causing the death of 17 Quebec citizens.

I was advised this morning, Mr. Speaker, by a person who lost two relatives in the tragedy, that next of kin cannot claim the remains of the victims without paying \$2,000 per body to a foreign company operating in Montreal which, it would appear, has approached all the relatives of the victims to that effect.

I am also informed, Mr. Speaker, that several families have vainly tried to get help from the Department of External Affairs in this connection.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the following motion for humanitarian reasons and in order to help the stricken families to repatriate in short order the remains of their next of kin:

That in the opinion of this House, in view of the tragic situation and the difficulties encountered by families in repatriating the remains of the Valdepenas tragedy victims, the government should make available to the victims' relatives the required air transport, offer the full co-operation of the Department of External Affairs to assist the stricken families in their arrangements for repatriating the remains without delay, and investigate on the requirements imposed on the victims' families by the company involved.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the pressing necessity of this question and its humanitarian aspects, the House will give its unanimous consent to this motion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the motion of the hon. member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade). As the hon. member knows, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House before it may be put. Is there unanimous agreement?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent so the motion cannot be put.

* * *

INDUSTRY

PULP AND PAPER—MEASURES TO ASSIST—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion under Standing Order 43 in a case of urgent necessity.

The pulp and paper industry is experiencing a critical period due to soft market conditions and the implications of the floating dollar. Besides the resultant lay-off of some 4,000 of the work force in the past nine months across the