

*Business of the House*

**Mr. Speaker:** The House heard the motion presented pursuant to Standing Order 43 which requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent to receive the motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent and the motion cannot be put.

SUGGESTED NEED FOR IMPROVED TRACK MAINTENANCE BY RAILWAYS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

**Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. This matter is the disclosure in the third report of the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission that derailments on the CNR and CPR in 1972 were triple the 1959 derailments and double the 1969 derailments; and that deaths and injuries from these derailments can only accelerate. The Transport Board proposes to reduce load weights and load heights, thus so further decreasing the performance record of these railways, "unless improved programs and standards of track maintenance are immediately undertaken to eliminate the causes of such derailments." I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall):

That this House, under its powers in the Railway Act, urges the government to order the CNR and the CPR forthwith to institute improved programs and standards of track maintenance so that these railways will fulfil their subsidized function of serving the Canadian public in a safe and efficient manner.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The House has heard the motion proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43 which requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There not being unanimous consent the motion cannot be put.

\* \* \*

● (1410)

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE IN DEALING WITH LEGISLATION RELATING TO GRAIN HANDLERS

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin):

That, during the debate on the motion for second reading of the bill intituled 'An Act to provide for the resumption of grain handling operations on the west coast of Canada', no member except for the first representative of each party shall speak for more than 20 minutes.

[Mr. Cossitt.]

And that the House shall not adjourn this day until the second reading stage of the said bill shall have been disposed of.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House has heard the motion. Is this agreed?

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there have been discussions about the first part of the motion, namely, that speeches after the first round shall be limited to 20 minutes each. We have indicated our readiness to agree to that proposal, but I know of no conclusive discussions on the proposal that we sit without time limit beyond ten o'clock.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Don't you want to end the strike?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Yes, of course, and we are prepared to take a vote at ten o'clock or even as late as eleven o'clock. I suggest that the motion be revised, and that the part limiting speeches to 20 minutes after the first round be agreed to now, but that the question of whether we shall sit beyond ten o'clock be left for further consultation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. We must be perfectly clear. The motion cannot be put without unanimous consent. This does not involve any question of coming to an agreement. The motion cannot be put in its present form without the unanimous agreement of the House. Is it agreed that the motion be put now?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** No, Mr. Speaker. We think this should be the subject of further consultation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then, if there is not unanimous consent, the motion in its present form cannot be put. Perhaps at the end of the question period I may inquire whether the latter part of the motion could be deleted. It might then be put.

**Mr. Baldwin:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, perhaps while members of the NDP are making up their minds about how long they want to talk in this debate, we could agree now on limiting speeches to 20 minutes. Could there not be an order of the House limiting speeches, after the first speakers on behalf of the government and the main opposition party have spoken, to 20 minutes. That would give the other parties a chance to consider this issue.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Social Credit party are in total agreement with the first part of the motion. But, in view of the fact that similar situations were not settled to the advantage of the parliamentarians, I feel the last part of the motion should be set aside and discussed more fully before being passed.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** To be quite clear, does the House agree to the following motion:

That, during the debate on the motion for second reading of the bill intituled 'An Act to provide for the resumption of grain handling operations on the west coast of Canada', no Member except for the first representative of each party shall speak for more than 20 minutes.