

Postal Dispute

making use of a report which differs from that which was subject to its previous approval. I would therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall):

That the House now adjourn for the purpose of discussing this matter of urgent public importance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will realize, I am sure, that the motion is out of order. He is asking for the adjournment of the House under the terms of Standing Order 43. This ought to be done under the terms of Standing Order 26. Therefore the motion cannot be put.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase my motion and move, instead, that the subject matter of my motion, namely, the breakdown in postal negotiations, be referred to the Standing Committee on Manpower and Labour?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is, of course, amending his motion with the consent of the House. There should be no difficulty about that, because he does not need to give notice of a motion under Standing Order 43. This having been said, I have to inquire whether there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There was unanimous consent to the hon. member rephrasing or amending his motion, but not to the motion being considered at this time. Therefore the motion cannot be put.

NEGOTIATIONS TO SETTLE DISPUTE WITH EMPLOYEES—
REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion which is in order under Standing Order 43. I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That in view of the postal unions' acceptance of the Conciliation Board Report and the announcement by the government of its acceptance thereof, this House calls on the government to desist from seeking to make unilateral changes in that report since such actions by the government may well lead to nationwide work stoppages, and urges that the government stand by its word and reach a settlement forthwith.

• (1410)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's motion is proposed under the terms of Standing Order 43. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity. The motion therefore cannot be put.

[Mr. McGrath.]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1971 (No. 1)

PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION TO BE DEEMED
ADVANCE

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-124, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 1).

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1971 (No. 2)

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING ENTITLEMENT, BENEFIT
PERIOD AND RATE

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-125, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 2).

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

TERRITORIAL SEA AND FISHING ZONES ACT

EXTENSION OF FISHING ZONES

On the order: Introduction of Bills.

January 15, 1973—Mr. Howard—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act".

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. Howard: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair will allow the proposed notice to stand, but perhaps I should take this opportunity to indicate to the hon. member that I have had the privilege of reading his proposed bill and was particularly interested, I might say fascinated, by the explanatory notes appended to the bill. I believe that the hon. member, on at least one previous occasion, was reminded by the Chair that explanatory notes ought to be guided by long-established principles.

In this connection may I refer the hon. member to citation 357 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, which indicates that explanatory notes ought to be brief. Brevity is a quality which is subjective in many ways and the hon. member's standards may be different from those of the Chair. But I have the impression that this explanatory note is not quite in keeping with the traditions and practices of the House.

I would suggest to all hon. members that explanatory notes should not be a second reading speech. I have the impression that the hon. member is arguing his case rather than giving an explanatory note. Perhaps the hon. member, who has asked that the matter be stood, might take a few minutes of his time to take a look at the explanatory notes and possibly make them a little less argumentative.