

*Western Grain Transportation Act*

trifling or incidental matter; it is attempting to change what has been referred to as Magna Carta of western Canada in terms of transportation policy.

● (1140)

Therefore it becomes extremely important for Members of Parliament, in fulfilling their responsibility, to be able to have an adequate or reasonable period of time for debate. The rules should be so interpreted because we are, after all, Parliamentarians representing our constituents. We should not be thwarted on a narrow or limited reading of the Standing Orders if there is a question or ambiguity.

With respect to the wording of the matter under consideration, we are now considering technically and for all purposes the amendment of the Hon. Member for Regina West which asks the House to vote on the proposition that this Bill be stood over for six months and brought back for consideration at that time.

When we have consideration of important legislation which is so highly emotional, and such importance is attached to it by people, particularly those in one important region of Canada, it seems to me that a reasonable interpretation of the Standing Orders should be that when we have an amendment at second reading the time clock should start again. We have a situation where we are entitled to full and legitimate debate on a proper amendment, properly accepted, properly before the House. We in the House of Commons who want to speak for a period of time on a matter which affects the very livelihood of the people we represent should not be thwarted by some unreasonable reading of this particular rule.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for your consideration of this particular point of order because I think it is more than legitimate and one which is of very serious consequence to this particular Bill.

**Mr. Lewis:** I rise on the same point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) seeking to speak on the same point of order?

**Mr. Benjamin:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) for raising this sort of ancillary or similar point of order to the one, which was just dealt with and on which I will not comment. I just wish the rule read the way Your Honour has ruled.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member is raising a point of order. He cannot go back on a decision of the Chair.

**Mr. Benjamin:** That is right, Mr. Speaker. I want to say to the Chair that I agree with the point raised by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West, that the time period presently being counted also counts on a debate on the amendment. Once the amendment has been dealt with, however long it may take, we return to debate the main motion and a new time period commences with reference to the eight hours and 20-minute speeches.

**Mr. Thacker:** I rise on the same point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis) was rising on the same point of order.

**Mr. Lewis:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) in making reference to this point of order. The amendments at second reading, as the Speaker will know, are very limited as to their application and what type of amendment can be made. The debate which has proceeded since the introduction of the amendment on the six-month hoist is basically as to whether or not the Bill is appropriate for the time and whether the six-month hoist should apply.

I would draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the Bill has a great deal of importance in Western Canada. Unfortunately, the Government—

**Mr. Benjamin:** All of Canada.

**Mr. Lewis:** —is in a very vulnerable position because it has no speakers of any import or knowledge from western Canada. It is very vital to the understanding of the Bill by the Parliament of Canada, by Hon. Members such as the Minister who is leaving the House, that we be able to hear the western Members and the viewpoint which they bring to the House.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) asked us to.

**Mr. Lewis:** I think for that reason alone we should have a broad interpretation of when that eight hours is to take place. Is it to be on the consideration of the entire Bill at second reading or, as we would suggest to Your Honour, is it to be on the six-month hoist amendment? Surely if we are to allow every Hon. Member to be heard, if we are to bring to the floor of the House the experience our Party on this important Bill, if Hon. Members from all over the country are properly to represent their constituents, surely we should have ample time.

I would suggest that that reason alone would bring Your Honour to rule that the eight-hour debate and eight-hour time limit should only relate to the six-month hoist amendment, that once the debate has collapsed on that matter and we have had a vote, we can then return to the second reading debate. Every Hon. Member in this House, for the benefit of the Government which lacks any Hon. Members from western Canada, can then be heard.

**Mr. Smith:** Mr. Speaker, I would first like to say that I am disappointed that my friend, the Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis), has suggested that any Hon. Members from the House of Commons are not important when he said that we did not have any important Members from the West. We have two Hon. Members from Manitoba.

**Mr. Lewis:** That is what I meant. I said that.

**Mr. Smith:** All Hon. Members of the House are important.

**Mr. Lewis:** That is what I said.

**Mr. Hargrave:** You are a little sensitive this morning.