

*Lay-Offs of Railway and Other Employees*

only come out in the sort of debate for which we are asking. Therefore because of the urgency, because this motion meets the criteria that Your Honour laid down in this excellent article, I hope you will find the motion to be in order.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank hon. members for their contribution to this interesting discussion, particularly the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I would remind the hon. member that the words he has quoted were spoken *ex cathedra* and therefore I do not feel bound by such *obiter dicta*. I feel that a much better authority is Beauchesne's fourth edition. Perhaps hon. members would allow me to refer to citation 100, which is well known and has been quoted in circumstances such as these. This citation has been referred to by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. Citation 100 says:

"Urgency" within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but it means "urgency of debate", when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the house do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough—

As has been said before, "early enough" is an absolutely relative term. One may ask how early is "early enough"? It has been mentioned that although the estimates have been completed there is to be a supply debate before the 27th of this month, that is within the next 19 days. Of course this is the outside limit, and debate on this motion might be had before that time by arrangement. In any event, it would definitely be brought before the house by that date. I have some doubts, therefore, whether the motion qualifies in view of this situation. I would also remind hon. members of paragraph 8 of citation 100 of Beauchesne's fourth edition wherein a former Speaker is quoted as having said:

I do not think that, under the standing order of 1882, a motion on a subject of this kind, having such a very wide scope, was ever contemplated. What I think was contemplated, was an occurrence of some sudden emergency, either in home or in foreign affairs. But I do not think it was contemplated—if the house will allow me to state my views—that a question of very wide scope, which would demand legislation to deal with it in any effective manner, should be the subject of discussion on a motion for the adjournment of the house.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I would think this citation covers the situation. For the guidance of hon. members I should like to refer them to an even more eminent authority, and quote from a ruling made by Mr. Speaker in the year 1961 following an adjournment motion proposed by

[Mr. Knowles.]

the then hon. member for Laurier. This motion had reference to a matter of definite urgent public importance, namely the displacement of C.N.R. employees. I am reading from *Hansard* of March 13, 1961 at page 2907. The Speaker then said:

As hon. members will recall, the matter of lay-offs of employees of the Canadian National Railways arises very frequently during the question period, and the minister is always under the necessity of having to say that he will inquire from the C.N.R. to find out what their policy is and that he will bring back an answer to the house. It seems to me that citation 100, which indicates that such matters should relate to the administrative responsibility of the government, might be applied in this case in the sense that the responsibility is indirectly through parliament and not one on which a debate on a motion of this kind could have any direct effect or result. It would be necessary for parliament to amend its Canadian National Railways legislation, if an enforceable decision is to be made or an effective remedy applied.

The Speaker concluded that he had to refuse the hon. member leave to make the motion.

In view of this precedent and in view of the citations I have quoted I do not think it is possible for me to accept the motion advanced by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

#### REQUEST FOR STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER AS TO CONFIDENCE IN MANAGEMENT

On the orders of the day:

**Hon. Michael Starr (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the following question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister complete confidence in the management of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?

**Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister):** I would be very glad to answer that question, but of course it is out of order.

**Mr. Starr:** In view of the fact that the Speaker did not voice an objection I would assume that that answer—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps Your Honour will give a ruling on it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Before making the ruling I would have to hear the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. I was still reflecting on standing order 26 when the question was asked.