

Western Grain Transportation Act

and perfectly legitimate form of making representations on behalf of Canadian citizens, is out of order and he is imputing that we on this side have engaged in that in a frivolous manner, I suggest that he reconsider those remarks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Are there any other Members who wish to address the point of order? Does the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) rise on the same point of order?

Mr. Anguish: Yes I do, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I would ask the Hon. Member, now that we have reverted to a more reasonable application of the rules, to address himself to the point of order, not debate.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I did not think I was entering debate when I initiated the point of order. I was asking for unanimous consent that the time limitation on speeches be extended, not only the hours but the time limitation on speeches. This is the most complex piece of legislation that has come before Parliament in my time here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member should address himself to the point of order, not debate. If he wants me to put the question as to whether there is unanimous consent, I will do so. I know immediately that there is not unanimous consent. Would the Hon. Member take his seat please.

Mr. Anguish: On a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I will recognize the Hon. Member on a point of order as soon as I have completed putting the question.

Mr. Anguish: It is on the same point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member may not speak twice on the same point of order. I would ask the Hon. Member to take his seat while I put the question.

Mr. Anguish: I rise on a new point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for the Battlefords-Meadow Lake seeks unanimous consent of the House to remove the time limit of ten minutes on any and all speeches during this process of debate under Standing Order 8(4)(a). Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I distinctly heard the Parliamentary Secretary rise in his place in this House and ask for time to consult with his Caucus. Subsequently you called for unanimous consent, although a

Member of the Government had asked for time to consult with his Caucus. I think it was very unfair to put that question to the House. If it had been on a different point of order, I suppose, or connected to that, they would have had time to consult and consider the wisdom of extending the time of the speeches.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I do not understand the Hon. Member's difficulty. There is no problem whatsoever in putting the same question to the House for unanimous consent later on. May I recognize Hon. Members for debate. The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for ten minutes on the Crow debate. I have not spoken often in this debate. I want to speak to Motion No. 50. Before I do and as a preface to that, as a Member from Vancouver, British Columbia, I am against this Bill and the changes in the Crow rate. I admit there will be some benefits to railway construction and so on. However, those benefits would come about anyway. I am told by my colleagues who are doing a magnificent job of trying to block this change in the Crow rate that while we may get a billion dollars in investment down the line, our farmers will lose a billion dollars down the line.

I believe my colleagues. They are honest men. They are sincere. Unlike the Government, they know western Canada. They tell me that the whole way of life in western Canada will be changed as a result of this Bill and that a culture will be destroyed. That is serious. That is what makes this debate important.

I listened to the Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger). I thought what he said was in pretty bad taste. He referred to "the way the NDP have operated in this House". The NDP have operated in one way, consistently, unlike the Conservative Party. The NDP has consistently opposed the changes in the Crow rate. The NDP has consistently taken the position that this legislation is no good. The Conservatives, in proposing this debate, are basically, if I can use the expression, just trying to protect their asses in this debate tonight. They are trying to protect their inconsistent position and the fact that the people in western Canada are very disappointed with the Conservatives and the way they have conducted themselves throughout this whole Crow debate. They are not fooling anybody by pulling this act tonight.

Let me speak on Motion No. 50, which is why we are here. The way the situation is now, the railways can state their intent as to what they are going to do with investment each year. We say in Motion No. 50 that the railways should have to state the intent as to how they are going to invest in railway upgrading. We want to put a specific amount into the upgrading and investment so that a decade from now we will know that we will really have an upgraded rail system and that the investment was put to good use, not piddled away by the railways as they have done with public grants in the past. That seems to be reasonable. My colleagues in the NDP, especially the prairie Members, have made reasonable amendments