

S.O. 43

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

RAILWAYS

RECOMMENDATIONS OF PRAC ON RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT— MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, on a matter as urgent and pressing as my two colleagues have raised concerning the Prairie Rail Action Committee report which recommends the abandonment of 1,416 miles of railway line in western Canada.

In view of the fact that in the 1974 election campaign the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) promised not to abandon rail service on branch lines as long as elevator companies considered that continued rail service was warranted, and since the PRAC report recommends the abandonment of 38 sections of rail line which the prairie wheat pools want maintained in the basic network, I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the Minister of Transport and the Prime Minister live up to their promise and reject the Prairie Rail Action Committee's abandonment recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of such a motion, pursuant to Standing Order 43, requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[Translation]

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT

REQUEST GOVERNMENT NOT AMEND LEGISLATION WITHOUT CONSULTING PROVINCES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to introduce a motion dealing with an important matter of pressing necessity.

Considering the impending federal-provincial conference to be held next month in Ottawa and considering the great importance given to the constitutional debate, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert):

That, should the federal-provincial conference of first ministers on the constitution fail, the House of Commons demand that the government give its firm assurance that it will not act unilaterally to amend certain sections of the British North America Act.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43, the introduction of such a motion can be done only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

• (1410)

[English]

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

REMARKS OF HON. MEMBER FOR LABELLE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, I rise, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, to move a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras) has stated that the government is not doing enough for business in this country, and that government policies and programs are confusing businessmen. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That the government refer the subject matter of the hon. member's remarks to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

URBAN AFFAIRS

UNIVERSALITY OF RRAP—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mrs. Jean E. Pigott (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43.

The government has proclaimed the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program to be universal but in a memorandum to the minister of housing and urban affairs the president of CMHC stated in part:

—neither the industry nor the municipal delivery system nor the present and projected RRAP budget permit the operation of a universal system.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House direct the Minister of State for Urban Affairs to make a statement on motions in order to clarify his so-called universal program, so that cynical observers will not interpret his inadvertent misrepresentation as crass pre-electioneering.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion for debate at this time can be done only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?