

procedure Your Honour is following? Does this mean the Prime Minister will now make a statement and that we are now in debate on second reading? We cannot go into debate on second reading without unanimous consent and unanimous consent was not given and is not being given now. If the house agrees to hear the statement of the Prime Minister and then adjourning—

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Douglas:—that is all right, but if there is to be a debate following the Prime Minister's statement we do not agree to proceeding with second reading. I want this clearly understood.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member opposing second reading or debate on second reading?

Mr. Douglas: I am denying unanimous consent to proceed with second reading. The house cannot proceed with second reading without unanimous consent and unanimous consent has been withheld.

Mr. Diefenbaker: By whom?

Mr. Douglas: By the members of this party. I want to make it clear that we are opposing it just as the Leader of the Opposition has made it perfectly clear that he is prepared to go ahead and rubberstamp the legislation of the government.

Mr. Starr: You are speaking out of the wrong side of your mouth.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I do not want that statement to go unchallenged. The hon. member speaks as if he had a solution to everything. Let me point out that when he was premier of Saskatchewan 95 strikes took place in that province.

Mr. Douglas: We did not settle any of them by compulsory arbitration.

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the point of order; since the members of the New Democratic Party seem to find it very difficult to understand anything, why does the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) not suggest that the house adjourn until October 5?

This would allow the members of the New Democratic Party to study the legislation and find an adequate solution.

23033—492½

Legislation Respecting Railway Matters

• (5:00 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. Crouse: The suggestion has been made by the leader of the N.D.P. that we delay consideration of this legislation until tomorrow. This is a stand which I, as the member for Queens-Lunenburg, find intolerable. It is indicative of the fact he is unaware of the emergency situation that exists in Canada. I regret to have to say this because he is one member I hold in high respect, but I must say he is using this situation to play party politics at the expense of the citizens of this country.

We have been called here in emergency session to deal with the strike which was called on Friday. We have been called here to deal with a national emergency. In my view the welfare of the people of Canada demands that we take immediate action on this matter. In my province of Nova Scotia we have farmers who are feeding chickens and they are dependent upon the shipment of western grain. If these shipments of grain do not arrive within the next three days, some half million pullets will starve. We have fishermen at sea who must land their catches and who will then be forced to tie up their ships because fish cannot be held indefinitely. We can freeze a certain amount of our catch, but the bulk of it must be shipped immediately while it is still in its fresh state. If we cannot ship our fish, we must tie up our fleet.

I say to the house and to the leader of the N.D.P. that it is time we set aside partisan politics and dealt with this national emergency. I know that the members of my party are prepared to sit here all night and all day tomorrow. If we fail to do this at this time, Mr. Speaker, then we fail to live up to our responsibility. I say this is an urgent matter. Let us co-operate with the government in dealing with this problem. Let us get the railroads functioning and restore service to the people of Canada because that is what they expect us to do.

Mr. Olson: In so far as the point of order that has been raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I know that you are in a difficult position because you did not hear unanimous consent being denied by some members who now claim that they voiced their opposition at that time. I recall very distinctly that when the bill was being introduced and given first reading you drew the attention of the