S.O. 26

[English]

The hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent).

Mr. Nielsen: A point of order, Madam Speaker. In the past your predecessors and I believe you yourself have established the precedent of calling motions under Standing Order 26 in the order in which the Chair received them or the order in which they were received by the Clerk. In this case, I believe yesterday at around 10.30 you received a submission by the member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) with respect to VIA Rail. I do not believe the Standing Order 26 that you were about to recognize was received until long after the office—

An hon. Member: What about Joe?

Mr. Nielsen: What about the Leader of the Opposition? The Leader of the Opposition had his filed at 10.05 a.m. yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, in keeping with that practice, which has been prevailing for such a long time in this place that it has almost the force, one might say, of a convention, I suggest that you recognize the hon. member for Vegreville since his notice was filed prior to the one on my left.

Madam Speaker: The hon. member will recognize that yes, it is true that I have been in the habit of recognizing questions in the order in which they come into my office. I hope the times are correctly noted because I have to rely on the notes that appear on the notice when it comes to my office.

Of course, the courtesy to recognize the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a normal one. I did want to recognize the hon. member for Oshawa because the question he raised is of a similar nature. I did say that before recognizing the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition. For this time I think the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) will abide with me and allow me to recognize the hon. member for Oshawa. Then we may deal later with the hon. member for Vegreville.

Mr. Lambert: But not as a precedent.

Madam Speaker: There is no rule. It is true that I am in the habit of doing this, but from time to time, for reasons I might have—I hope they would not be capricious—I might do something else.

Mr. Nielsen: May I just reassure myself that your action in this particular instance is not to be construed as a precedent?

Madam Speaker: Indeed.

ALLEGED NATIONAL ECONOMIC CRISIS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I hope the member who just spoke will agree that the issue before us, the Canadian economy, is a little more important than who gets to move which motion first.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Madam Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Rae), to move the adjournment of the House pursuant to Standing Order 26 for the purpose of debating a specific and important matter requiring urgent and immediate consideration; namely, the record increase in the non-food consumer price index in September, the ruinous levels of interest and mortgage rates, and the record 100,000 increase in unemployment which took place in September—all of which make it urgent that we have an immediate debate on which can only be described as a national economic crisis.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: I can only repeat that the request made by the hon. member for Oshawa is quite similar in nature to the application which I have received from the Leader of the Opposition and on which I have just ruled. I will also rule on the request made by the hon. member for Oshawa. I remind him that some of the questions he has spelled out in his application have been dealt with earlier in this House on many other occasions. The problems to which he refers are of a continuing nature and do not justify the allowance of a debate of an emergency nature.

I, therefore, regret I cannot receive the application of the hon. member for Oshawa.

VIA RAIL

ABANDONMENT OF PASSENGER SERVICES

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Madam Speaker, I too rise under the provisions of Standing Order 26, seconded by the hon. member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight), to ask leave of the House to consider a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. It arises out of the announcement made on July 27, shortly after the House adjourned for the summer recess, of drastic alterations in Canada's passenger rail service which affected some 19 per cent of the lines, deprive 1.2 million Canadians of service and result in the loss of an estimated 1,600 jobs of railway workers.

This action has not been debated, nor approved by the Canadian Transport Commission or the House of Commons. It will inflict untold hardship upon those whose jobs will be lost. It will have a serious social and economic impact upon others affected both directly and indirectly. These cuts will substantially diminish the comprehensiveness and utility of our