

S.O. 30

[English]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, if question No. 4,101 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Is it the pleasure of the House that question No. 4,101 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ATTENDING UNIVERSITY

Question No. 4,101—**Mr. Neil:**

1. In each year 1975 to 1982, how many employees of the Department of Agriculture were given extended absences to attend university to study for either a Masters degree or a PhD and, in each case (a) what was his/her name (b) what were his/her qualifications when he/she joined the Department (c) on what date did he/she join the Department and on what date was he/she given the extended absence (d) for what period is his/her extended absence and which university will he/she be attending (e) what remuneration was paid during his/her period of extended absence?

2. Is an employee on extended absence under contract with the Department to return and work with the Department after completing his/her studies and, if so, what are the terms of the contract?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been replied to. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 30

[English]

RAILWAYS

ANNOUNCED CHANGES IN CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Madam Speaker: I have a notice of motion for an emergency debate by the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent).

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) to move adjournment of the House under Standing Order 30 for the purpose of discussing a

specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely: the announcement this morning by the federal Government of its intention to break unilaterally, the historic Crowsnest Pass Freight Rate Agreement; an agreement which dates back to 1896 and which guarantees to grain farmers freight rates in perpetuity and which provides in return to the CPR, material, land and mineral rights; an agreement which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had promised a number of times in the House of Commons would not be changed without a consensus among grain farmers. An agreement thus unilaterally broken constitutes a complete breach of trust between the Prime Minister and the Government on the one hand and those affected by the agreement on the other hand.

Madam Speaker: There can be no doubt that the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Oshawa is important. The Chair must be satisfied that all the conditions laid down by the Standing Order are being met in this case.

Section (16)(a) states that the matter proposed for discussion must relate to a genuine emergency. In his proposed motion, the Hon. Member for Oshawa states that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has promised a number of times in the House of Commons that the agreement would not be changed without a consensus among grain farmers. The matter has therefore been raised before in this House, and indeed in numerous ways. For example, on February 26, 1982, a supply motion was moved and debated which read in part as follows:

That this House condemns the Government for abandoning the historical and statutory rights of western grain producers by proposing an end to the Crowsnest Pass freight rate.

I must also point out that the Hon. Member stated in his notice the matter to be:

—the announcement this morning by the federal Government of its intention to break unilaterally the historic Crowsnest Pass Freight Rate Agreement;

No indication is given in the notice as to when a decision may be taken or implemented. Under those circumstances, the Chair finds no justification for the contention that the matter calls for immediate and urgent consideration. The House, in all probability, will find the opportunity in the near future, as it has, for instance, during the Question Period, to discuss this matter in another context.

Finally, the Chair has serious reservations in connection with the terms in which the proposed motion is couched. That type of motion is perhaps more in the nature of a non-confidence motion. May I quote in part from a ruling made by Mr. Speaker Lamoureux on June 29, 1971, as will be found on page 7434 of *Hansard* of that date. It reads:

I would indicate to the Hon. Member that in my view this is not the kind of motion or the kind of subject which ought to be considered under the terms of Standing Order 26. This is essentially a motion of non-confidence. It is a substantive motion. It does not deal with a matter which is a sudden occurrence.

Under these circumstances, it is with regret that I must decide that the matter is not proper to be discussed at this time under the terms of Standing Order 30.

Mr. Broadbent: Madam Speaker, for technical reasons I am not entirely surprised by your ruling and I respect that judg-