

Prohibition of Interprovincial Marketing

appreciate being taken into the full confidence of the government.

I am sure members in all parts of the House express their sincere sorrow and regrets both to the family of Mr. Cross and to the British government. We hope the government will be able to give some further information to the country as to what success has crowned its efforts.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, this morning's incident is most unfortunate. As a citizen of the province of Quebec, I am sorry this happened in Canada's metropolis where bombshells are not unusual, as we know.

Mr. Speaker, a distinction should now be made. The city of Montreal as a whole or all its inhabitants are not responsible for what happened. However, we must admit that a few twisted minds, a few hot-heads are enough for such an incident to happen. I deeply regret that this took place again in the province of Quebec, as it seems to me that most of the citizens of that province do not deserve what they are going through today because of some individuals.

I hope that the consul kidnapped this morning will be found by the police safe and sound and will not have been subjected to further assaults or insults because he has gone through enough already. I expect that those responsible for that kidnapping will be punished in an exemplary fashion in order to avoid repetition of such an incident in Quebec as well as in the rest of Canada. There is no need to resort to such means and to copy what happens in some other rebellious countries of the world. We have not reached that point yet. And I say again that it is distressing to see that there are such hot-heads in Quebec and especially in Montreal.

[English]

AGRICULTURE

PROHIBITION OF INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I intend to ask the House for unanimous consent to present a motion on a matter of pressing and urgent necessity. In accordance with the rule, I now explain the basis of the urgency which compels me to seek this leave.

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

A most critical situation has developed since the House adjourned last June; it is caused by the unilateral action of several provinces to prohibit, through marketing legislation, the entry into such provinces of farm products from other provinces. Such action appears to be clearly unconstitutional, particularly under Section 121 of the British North America Act; however, a judgment of a provincial court has upheld the prototype of such provincial legislation. A final appeal of this judgment may take many months. Meanwhile, other provinces have indicated they will pass retaliatory laws. There is now a drastic interference with the economics of the agricultural industry which may spill over into the other primary industries and the manufacturing industry as well.

The Prime Minister, with respect to the agricultural crisis, indicated that the passage of Bill C-197 would by itself provide the solution, that there was no need for a constitutional reference to the Supreme Court of Canada to settle the matter once and for all. He was wrong on both counts. With the failure of the government to bring in an acceptable bill which would be passed by Parliament this session and accepted by the provinces, it is now absolutely essential that there be an immediate reference to the Supreme Court. I therefore ask the unanimous consent of the House to propose, seconded by the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth), the following motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is essential that the government of Canada, upon consultation with the provinces, frame terms of reference under section 55 of the Supreme Court Act to secure the opinion of the court as soon as possible on the important constitutional questions raised by action taken by certain provinces attempting to prohibit the entry into such provinces of agricultural products from other provinces.

Mr. Trudeau: A delaying process.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, the motion proposed by the hon. member for Peace River requires the unanimous consent of the House and I must inquire now whether there is such unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there are dissenting voices, the motion cannot be put at this time.

Mr. Trudeau: I do not agree with delaying tactics so I said no.