

## OPERATION LIFT

Question No. 1,003—**Mr. Thomson:**

1. What were the amounts paid in (a) salary (b) expenses, to all persons engaged in Operation Lift?
2. Were any individuals who work for PFAA engaged in Operation Lift and, if so, what were their (a) names (b) addresses (c) salaries (d) expenses?
3. What department actually managed the field work of Operation Lift?
4. If there was another agency or department involved in addition to PFAA, what was the liaison between them?

Return tabled.

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

## LABOUR RELATIONS

## EFFECT OF RAIL TRAFFIC DISRUPTION ON GRAIN MOVEMENT

**Mr. Paul Yewchuck (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 26 I ask leave to move a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the disruption of rail traffic and its present consequences, particularly on the movement of grain to meet Canada's export commitments. This emergency calls for discussion of measures that can be taken immediately to get prairie grain aboard ship at Vancouver to meet these commitments, for discussion of action to ensure that isolated communities get supplies, for discussion of the appointment of an independent conciliator to bring the railways and unions to settlement as quickly as possible in the national interest, and discussion of the appointment of a task force or other body to recommend long-term plans for the settlement of such disputes on the basis of public convenience and necessity. If this proposal is acceptable to you, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Thomas), that this House do adjourn for this purpose.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Athabasca has given the Chair due notice of his intention to move the proposed motion under the terms of Standing Order 26. In dealing with the matter stated, I think I owe it to the Chair, to the hon. member and to the House to refer once again to the form of the motion proposed by the hon. member.

The House well knows that Standing Order 26 requires that notice should be given to the Chair accompanied by a statement of the matter to be considered, and that the statement made by the hon. member in the House under the terms of Standing Order 26 should not go beyond the notice which has been given to the Chair, should be limited entirely to a statement of the matter itself, should not include enumeration of circumstances, and should not include any argument. I suggest respectfully to the hon.

24081—22

## Motions for Papers

member that again the form is perhaps somewhat defective, and I would hope hon. members would try to bear this in mind. Of course, in such an important matter I would not think I should rule on it entirely from the procedural aspect. I think the situation is so important that it does require substantive and substantial consideration by the Chair.

As the hon. member for Athabasca knows, a similar motion was proposed in the House just the day before yesterday by the hon. member for Moose Jaw. At that time I suggested to the House that the Chair should not overlook the condition and it is a very important one, that there can be only one discussion about a question during the same session under the terms of Standing Order 26. So there is a considerable responsibility on the part of hon. members and on the part of the Chair, when a serious condition is developing, to ensure that the debate, if one is permitted under Standing Order 26, should come at the appropriate time. I am not convinced that the situation has changed so much since Monday that a debate should be allowed today. I am very anxious to follow the matter as closely as possible along with hon. members and perhaps in consultation with them, so that if the point should be reached where it appears that it would be advantageous to the House, to Parliament and to the country that an emergency debate should take place, a motion under Standing Order 26, would be granted.

I reiterate my feeling that this is a matter of extreme importance and of great urgency. The question to determine, if an emergency debate is to be had, is when it should be called. I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that we have not reached that stage today. I shall continue to keep the matter under consideration and, as I said, if hon. members feel it will be of value I shall consult with hon. members representing the different parties as the situation develops from day to day.

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notice of motion No. 133?

## DEVELOPMENT OF CITÉ DU HAVRE

Motion No. 133—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the plan prepared by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation regarding the development of Cité du Havre in Montreal and discussed in May between officials of CMHC, Montreal and the National Harbours Board.

**Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation advises that the report is at this point a confidential one, and that consequently it