

*Labour Conditions***MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26****LABOUR CONDITIONS**

ALLEGED URGENT SITUATION DISCLOSED BY RELEASE OF CURRENT UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES—MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for York South, 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 urgent situation revealed in the unemployment statistics released today, showing 10.5 per cent unemployment for the Atlantic area, 8 per cent for Quebec, 5 per cent for British Columbia and 5.4 per cent as the over-all figure for the entire country, and the failure of the government to provide policies to cope with this situation.

More significantly, Mr. Speaker, since these April statistics do not yet reflect the 600,000 students who are presently entering the labour force seeking job opportunities for the summer months, it is doubly urgent that parliament adjourn to discuss this important matter.

In conclusion, may I refer Your Honour to your ruling of March 13, 1969, as reported in *Hansard*. Your Honour ruled that, in considering whether such a general subject can be put before the house, the general rule be discarded if the circumstances of a continuing situation reached critical proportions. I propose that such a time has arrived.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. There are two points I should like to make in connection with the motion proposed by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, of which he has given appropriate notice under the terms of Standing Order 26. The first point has reference to the form of the notice. Standing Order 26 requires that a member wishing to move that the house do now adjourn shall give to Mr. Speaker a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed. Subsection (3) adds that at the appropriate moment the member shall rise in his place and present without argument the statement in question. The purpose of the new rule is obviously to eliminate argument in support of or in opposition to urgency of debate.

I fear that we will return to the previous unsatisfactory situation which the house has

sought to correct in adopting the new standing order if the statement filed by an hon. member and read to the house is also an argument supporting urgency of debate. Hon. members may want to consider this suggestion when motions under Standing Order 26 are presented to the Chair.

When the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands proposed his motion and read the last paragraph I noticed that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) wanted to rise on a point of order. I assume that this is the point he wanted to raise. If we revert to a situation under which hon. members take advantage of the opportunity of making a statement to argue urgency, I am sure we will then have members from the government side also wanting to rise on a point of order to debate the question of non-urgency, and we will then be where we were before the rules were amended.

In respect of the substance of the matter, I have to refer hon. members to rulings made in similar circumstances on January 14, March 13 and May 8 during the current session. It was then suggested to the house that by long established practice a motion under Standing Order 26 could not be entertained in such circumstances. I would have to make the same ruling, even in the particular conditions outlined by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

There is of course the additional consideration that by agreement this day has been set aside as an allotted day under the terms of Standing Order 58. I submit that circumstances would have to be extremely exceptional to justify an adjournment motion on a day which already has been allotted to the opposition for the purpose of proposing a specific motion of non-confidence.

I regret, therefore, that I cannot put the hon. member's proposed motion to the house.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

VIET NAM—PARTICIPATION BY CANADA IN SUPERVISORY BODY TO EFFECT SETTLEMENT

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister a question arising out of the proposals announced last evening by President Nixon designed to obtain negotiated peace in Viet Nam. Will the right