

unanimous consent of the House to move a motion on an important matter requiring urgent consideration.

The Canadian National Railways have announced their decision to discontinue the service of trains Nos. 122 and 123 in eastern Quebec. The decision constitutes an infringement of the spirit of the agreement concluded by the government of Canada and the government of Quebec about the eastern part of Quebec, which is obviously a matter of national concern. It is a unilateral decision in which the population had no part whatsoever, it will jeopardize the development of our region and it denies the principle of participatory democracy.

Therefore, seconded by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. LeBlanc), I move:

That the House invite the government to make strong representations to the Canadian National to make them cancel their plan to discontinue trains 122 and 123 and undertake real consultations with the people of eastern Quebec.

• (2:20 p.m.)

I believe that my colleague would like to put in a word.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has proposed a motion under the terms of Standing Order 43 requiring the unanimous consent of the House.

Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: I might say that it is difficult for the Chair to determine whether there is unanimity.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard a number of yeas but I am not sure whether other sounds could be interpreted as nays.

An hon. Member: Let the government House leader say no, if he dares.

An hon. Member: No.

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

Mr. Hees: Some dirty Liberal said no.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

* * *

GRAIN

LETTERS TO PRODUCERS FOLLOWING PAYMENTS
UNDER TEMPORARY WHEAT RESERVES ACT—REQUEST
FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER
S.O. 43

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I rise to request the unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. This matter concerns the conduct of the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board in connection with pay-

Wheat Reserves Payments

ments recently received by prairie grain producers under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Downey: If I have the unanimous consent of the House I propose to move the following motion, seconded by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski):

Whereas, in letters dated the 20th October, 1971, and addressed to and received by prairie grain producers on the same day or shortly after the producers received payments lawfully made under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, the minister responsible for the Wheat Board deliberately and incorrectly stated that the government had been forced to withdraw its proposed prairie grain receipts stabilization program although the minister knew the bill was and is on the order paper of this House under government business; and—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is making a speech. He knows that this cannot be done. He should indicate what the motion is.

An hon. Member: He is reading the motion now.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure whether he is reading the motion now but if he is that should be brought to the attention of the Chair.

Mr. Downey: I beg your indulgence, Mr. Speaker. I am coming to the point. I continue:

Whereas the minister deliberately and untruthfully stated that the courts would have been in an awkward position in hearing a case under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act while Parliament was debating the repeal of that act although the Minister is fully aware that this House debated and passed a Bill to repeal the Surcharge on Imports Order, now chapter 18 of the 1963—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I feel I must take exception to the kind of procedure now being followed by the hon. member for Battle River. I suggest to him, and I have had occasion to remind the hon. member for Battle River of the very same point, that the purposes of Standing Order 43 do not permit argument and do not permit one to engage in debate in circumstances where no opportunity is provided under the terms of the Standing Order for anyone to reply to the motion proposed by the hon. member. The only way in which the matter can be handled, in so far as the hon. member is concerned, is for the hon. member to indicate the urgency of the matter and propose the motion. He cannot argue, as he is now arguing, his case in support of the motion. He should indicate what the motion is and then the Chair will ascertain whether there is unanimous consent. But there should not be unilateral debate of the type in which the hon. member is now engaged.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, I was only trying to show the precedents with regard to the case we are now reviewing which involves the Wheat Board. I will briefly finish, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Propose the motion.

Mr. Downey: In essence, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the stabilization program that has been before the House I move: