

*Unemployment*

member here was, that he was raising a question supplementary to the one that had been asked already of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. As a result of that some confusion arose, but Your Honour had not yet called orders of the day; consequently the question was regarded as supplementary to the other questions that had been asked.

In view of the statement made by the Minister of Labour yesterday indicating that nearly 700,000 people were seeking work, or that over 700,000 people were seeking work, so far as the urgency of debate is concerned who is there who would deny that there is some urgency of discussion in this regard?

As for the third point made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, certainly I was quite unaware that any decision or any announcement had been made that there would be a supply motion next Monday. I had not heard about it. I do not think any member on this side of the house had been notified that such a debate was to arise on Monday next. Even if the announcement had been made—and I am quite sure it had not been made—there is no guarantee that such a debate would be held. Something else might intervene which would have set aside that debate or that opportunity.

Consequently I would say that on all counts the hon. member for Comox-Alberni raised this matter at the right time and in the right place, as far as we were able to gather from discussions which occurred; that there is urgency, and that we have no knowledge of a supply motion foreshadowed for next Monday or Tuesday.

**Mr. Green:** Mr. Speaker, this is one of the unfortunate features which—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I have come to the conclusion that this debate should not be allowed. Unless the hon. member wishes to address himself to something else I think perhaps he would not want to be heard again. Perhaps I do the minister an injustice; he may wish to change his mind and speak again.

The motion is made under standing order 26, which permits a motion for the adjournment of the house when made for the purpose of discussion of a definite matter of urgent public importance. I will not deal with the preliminary point of order because it is unnecessary to deal with it in the view I take of the motion itself.

However, I would say this without referring to the authorities or the practice in the past. Even when orders of the day are called by the Speaker, it seems to me that we have not yet entered upon the business of the

house until the first order is read. The house is still in the interval between routine proceedings and orders of the day. I do not see how it can be otherwise. It is in that period when questions are addressed to the ministry, which questions we shall have in a moment or two, and when motions of this kind are to be made. That is my view at this time but, as I say, I do not need to decide that point in order to deal with the matter before the house. I shall therefore leave that question open and look into it further.

That the motion itself raises a matter of great public urgency, there is no doubt. I am sure all members of the house appreciate the fact that there is little that is of greater importance to the house and to the country than unemployment and its incidence in the country. But it is a situation which develops slowly and, as far as I have been able to judge in the past, it is one that can be dealt with only deliberately and through the course of time.

Therefore if there is opportunity to discuss the matter in the house it does not seem to me that it is something which has to be dealt with today, and for which we should interrupt the regular routine of the business of the house. There has been a great deal of talk about the unemployment situation during this session, and I am sure there will be a great deal more, without allowing this additional debate which will interfere with the planned routine of the business of the house. Hence I do not consider it a debate which should be entered upon at this stage.

**Hon. Lionel Chevrier (Laurier):** Mr. Speaker, I rise not to discuss your ruling but rather on a point of order, in order to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance a statement which he made a moment ago, and which is entirely foreign to us on this side of the house, when he said that all of us were aware that on Monday we were to take up a motion to go into supply. Certainly I have received no notice of that intention and my friend the house leader will, I am sure, tell the minister so. It is perhaps some indication of the information which our house leader wishes to give us and has not given us thus far.

My only purpose in rising is to say that I do not want to sit here and have the Minister of Finance make that kind of statement when I know it is not correct. We have received no such notice, and until we do—

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Green:** That was one of the points with which I intended to deal before Your Honour made the very acceptable decision which you did make.