

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, May 8, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received which is as follows:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
OTTAWA

8 May 1969

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Ronald Martland, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 8th day of May, at 5.30 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your obedient servant,
Esmond Butler
Secretary to the Governor General.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Fourth report of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs—Mr. Tolmie.

[*Note: Text of above report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ALLEGED UNPRECEDENTED INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING—MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the unprecedented and very serious increase of more than 1 per cent in the consumer price index, the cost of living, during the past

month—the culmination of the steady rise in the cost of living which has been taking place for the past several years because of the failure of the government to take steps to deal with this critical situation, and particularly the refusal of the government to arrange for this house to discuss and debate the economic problems which have brought about this serious situation.

Mr. Speaker: The motion proposed by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) is based on a Dominion Bureau of Statistics report which indicates an increase in the consumer price index. As hon. members know similar motions have been proposed earlier in the course of the current session, motions which dealt with D.B.S. reports on unemployment.

● (2:10 p.m.)

Standing Order 26 requires not only that a problem be important, urgent and national in scope but that the discussion of such a matter be a matter of urgency. Even under the new rules the relevant factor in Standing Order 26 is urgency of debate rather than urgency of the matter itself.

It would appear that a motion such as this one can be allowed only if the ensuing debate could be expected reasonably to affect the course of the urgent situation or to result in immediate corrective action. I doubt that this could possibly be achieved by an adjournment debate dealing with a continuing situation such as unemployment or the international balance of payments or the volume of exports or inflation.

Since the beginning of the session we have had a number of debates dealing with economic matters. These debates have ranged far and wide, touching particularly on unemployment, taxes and inflation. It can be expected that a number of similar debates will occur before the end of this part of the current session. I have in mind particularly the debate on the anticipated presentation by the Minister of Finance.

For the moment I do not think I would be justified in allowing this additional debate in preference to the planned business of the house.