

concept, they will be able to go to the statement contained in the legislation for interpretation.

Is there anyone on the Government side who is prepared to stand up and suggest that it is objectionable to the Government that grain producers should retain the benefit of a statutory freight rate and be protected from freight rate increases disproportionate to international grain prices? Are Government Members suggesting that that should not be part of the objectives of the Bill?

Mr. Flis: What does that have to do with what is before us as to whether the motion is acceptable or not? Speak to what is before the House.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Precisely. Of course, the Parliamentary Secretary is so terribly sensitive. I have now struck a chord with the Government spokesman on the Bill. The Parliamentary Secretary is nervous and twitchy, knowing how it is almost impossible to stand up and simply state a fact as to whether that is the Government's position. If that is inconsistent, let him rise and argue that the amendment bears no relationship to the intentions of the Bill. That is the relevance, and that is what I am discussing. I am suggesting that now is the time for Hon. Members opposite to stand up and tell the people in western Canada, indeed across the whole country, whether or not what is contained in Motion No. 1 is a fair statement of the purposes of the legislation. I am not requesting a long statement, but let the Hon. Member just stand and say, for example, "No. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government, we do not agree that the railway companies and the Government of Canada should accept a continuing obligation to provide producers with a special transportation rate for the movement of grain". If that is not the Government's policy, let him stand up.

Here comes the Minister now. He is probably the man who is best able to speak on behalf of the Government in the matter. If the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) feels that that is not an objective of the legislation, let him rise during the debate and say so in front of the people of Canada. Then we can understand how the Speaker will be able to suggest that that is not appropriate because it is a new, novel item, that is not part of the intention of the legislation. Then we will not be under any illusions.

The Minister of Transport is ready to be involved in this procedural debate. He should speak to the question as to whether or not the Government believes that the Government of Canada should make an annual financial contribution to the grain transportation system to ensure fair compensation for the movement of grain. Is this part of the intention contained in the legislation? Is it part of the intention of the Government in the legislation that the railway companies provide adequate equipment and plant capacity to move grain efficiently and reliably? I ask the Minister simply to stand in his place and tell me whether it is inconsistent with the Government's intention in the legislation that the natural advantages of western agriculture be recognized and strengthened. I use these only as examples of the very simple way in which the matter could be

Western Grain Transportation Act

disposed of and dispatched. I make this proposition to you, Mr. Speaker, as strongly as I can. However, I see that since another person has just taken the chair, my argument will probably have to be repeated.

An Hon. Member: No, don't do that.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It was so forceful and effective on the previous occupant of the Chair, the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor), that I think I was actually convincing him. He was nodding in agreement over everything I was saying.

I put forward a very simple proposition that no one from the Government side has yet been heard to say that there is anything stated in Motion No. 1 which is not in agreement with the intention of the Bill. We can argue in the substantive debate that the Bill does not accomplish the purposes set forth in Motion No. 1.

Mr. Flis: Your House Leader ruled it out of order.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: My House Leader is an eminent procedural expert. If my House Leader ruled it out of order, that means that he has now been appointed as the Speaker of the House. I do not think that that particular appointment would be one the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would entertain at this time in history. I make no further comment on that.

Mr. Huntington: Maybe the former Minister will.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I think I have made my case very strongly that there have been no nay-sayers from the Government side. Another item in Motion No. 1 is the provision that the economic distortions within the agriculture sector stemming from a statutory rate will be reduced for livestock products and processed agricultural products, and finally, as contained in subparagraph (g), that grain producers will receive adequate guarantees of system performance and service.

Concerning each of these items to which I have referred, if Government Members feel that such is not a reasonable statement of the purpose of the Bill, they can stand up right now and put an end, I suppose, to the entire procedural debate, by saying, "That is not our intention". However, once one starts off with a proposition that there has been no statement to the contrary by the Government spokesman or by the Minister of Transport, then that should set the ground for the legitimacy of the motion, because one would then consider the very narrow point as to whether or not it should be ruled objectionable because it is, in effect, a preamble.

I want to deal with the secondary point very briefly. Should this be considered as a mere preamble, or should it be considered as a fundamental part of the legislation which, in fact, elucidates the provisions of the legislation for greater clarity? In the old days, as my colleague said, of "8-cylinder words", I was able to charge \$75 an hour for this kind of dissertation.

Mr. Pepin: Seventy-five cents.