

Western Grain Transportation Act

that any other ruling would clearly not permit the Standing Order as it is written to be put into force.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis) is right. The motion on the previous question is debatable and probably will be debated. However, it is not up to the Chair to decide.

My next comment is that the motion on the previous question is not closure, because after the House votes on the previous question, the debate on the main question will, of course, be resumed. When the previous question is put, this is done only in order to prevent the proposal of new amendments and to ensure that the debate continues on the main question.

As for the last question put to the Chair, namely, what time limits apply in the circumstances, I must say that the Hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) and the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) are right. In the opinion of the Chair, and after thorough consideration of how the new Standing Orders could be interpreted, the provisions of Standing Order 35(2) apply. We are, in fact, debating the second reading of a Bill and we have exceeded the eight-hour period. Consequently, a ten-minute time limit for each speaker applies to debates at this stage in the proceedings.

[English]

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Hon. Member. I understand that he has been recognized and has the floor for debate. Earlier this morning I was asked by the House Leader of the Official Opposition not to sit until five o'clock. As far as I am concerned, if the House wants to adjourn until five o'clock, I have no objection.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement that the sitting shall be suspended until five o'clock this day?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is agreed and so ordered.

SITTING SUSPENDED

At 3.45 p.m. the sitting of the House was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 5 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) has the floor.

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I last spoke on this Bill on the six-month amendment on May 24 and I put some rather strong remarks on the record at that time. I am very surprised that the Hon. Member for Rosemont (Mr. Lachance) would move the previous question motion today. I find it rather strange that a prominent Member who worked so hard on procedures with so many of us for the past year would

do that to the House, particularly on a Bill that is so important to the region I come from. The cleavage within the debate seems to be a regional one between Quebec Members and Members from the West.

It seems that Quebec Members are under the impression that allowing the subsidy to go to the growers in the West will work to the disadvantage of their cattle and hog-feeding operations, particularly the hog-feeding operation which has been so successful as a result of activities in the Province of Quebec. It is my understanding that even the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) and the Government have tried to impress upon Members from Quebec that that is not really an issue. Feed grain prices in the Province of Quebec are a corn and soybean formula based on Thunder Bay plus freight or Chicago gate prices.

Please allow me to proceed with the debate that I want to make. It is my understanding that the strength of feelings in the West in no way, shape or form impinge upon the very successful hog raising activities in the Province of Quebec. I am sure that the Minister of Transport can agree totally with that statement.

I think the principle of the Bill was put in the most simple terms by Stan Price on May 16, 1983 when he said:

Put simply, if someone said they would cover all of the transportation costs on pork and I pay full compensatory rate on grain, where would I locate a hog operation—right next to the grain fields. Or if they said they would pay all of the cost of shipping grain and I had to pay full freight costs on pork, I would locate the hog production and meat packing right next to Montreal, New York or Tokyo.

That is the issue here. What we are debating is the method of payment. We do not agree with the method of payment that the Minister of Transport has finally proposed in Bill C-155. Members in western Canada, and particularly British Columbia where I come from, have been inundated by a powerful lobby by industrial leaders. The Council of Forest Industries of B.C. wants us to pass Bill C-155 and not delay the Government. The president and chief executive officer of B.C. Forest Products wants the same thing. We have received a wire from the president of MacMillan Bloedel who wants us not to delay the Bill. On Wednesday, June 15, we received a submission from the Employers' Council of British Columbia telling us not to hold up the Bill. I have received other wires from 15 or 20 industrialists from British Columbia who have lobbied us. They are absolutely shocked that we are so upset with the Bill. I have even had a telephone call from the Chamber of Commerce accusing me of not representing the interests of British Columbia. I want to say that that is totally false, Mr. Speaker.

Let me discuss the principle of the Bill, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Transport had things in the palm of his hand, the way he was going. Even Mr. Bruce Howe, the president and chief executive officer of British Columbia Resources Investment Corporation, who has been organizing the lobby on B.C. Members, made a speech on January 26, 1982 in which he