

want to deal during report stage of Bill C-155. I ask the Chair to seek unanimous consent of the House to dispose of the time limitation on speeches this evening for the remainder of extended hours.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. We certainly would not have any objection to that. However, I re-emphasize that the basic reason for our Party moving the extension of hours was simply in the hope we would be able to get to what we consider to be some of the very fundamental issues and points which have yet to be debated.

Mr. Speaker, if you have followed the progress of the Bill, you will know that in the course of committee consideration we were not able to deal with the subject of the safety net because it was ruled out of order in that it went beyond the Royal Proclamation or the intent of the Bill as expressed in the vote on second reading. We were unable to debate in a meaningful way the issue of the method of payment because it was ruled out of order. While the particular subject of the British Columbia coal lands was debated somewhat, we were constrained in debating it fully by virtue of the time deadline on the committee. Originally the committee was to report on September 12, and there was a two-week extension. However, we ran out of time.

These are the things we were unable to debate fully. I have referred to the safety net. There was also our proposal which would result in the maintenance of the existing statutory freight rate until the review process was completed; that would be July 31, 1986. Also there was the whole question of the commission of inquiry. It was another issue that was not debated in committee because it was found to be beyond the scope of the Bill.

The thrust of our motion for extended hours was the hope and anticipation that we would be able to deal with those very important matters. If Parliament is to discharge its responsibilities in an effective manner, particularly on this very important and contentious Bill, a Bill which enjoys relatively little support, if any, other than from the railway sector, it is incumbent upon Parliament to debate it. Canadian people, in particular those in the agricultural community, are expecting their representatives to debate these important issues. Within the framework of those thoughts, I would hope Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party would reconsider their tactics and allow progress to be made so that we can get to those issues and have the opportunity to debate them.

Just a few moments ago a member of the Press Gallery telephoned and asked me when we were expected to debate the amendment of the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) concerning the safety net. I said that if it went to the bottom of the list it might never happen. We would like to debate it. We would like to hear what the Minister has to say. We would like to hear him elaborate on what is meant by the 4 per cent and the 5 per cent escalating safety net.

I hope NDP Members will reconsider their tactics. We would certainly support an extension in the time limit of

Western Grain Transportation Act

speeches, but I implore them to allow the debate to move ahead. Surely it does not require 30 Members of that Party to debate a motion such as the one proposed by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). I will not comment on whether or not it is important. I think that issue was well dealt with by an amendment which was accepted by the committee. Here we are rehashing a lot of the information which was dealt with, in some detail, in committee. Some Hon. Members of the NDP are really trying to get their feet wet on this Bill. During the course of committee hearings they had one "Lone Ranger" who really carried the whole burden. Now all these followers, these trained seals, are trying to get into the act.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Both the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) and the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) will recognize that the Chair has attempted in every way to facilitate them so that they might proceed. However, at this point I think the Hon. Member is entering into debate rather than a point of order.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, this is the first we have heard of the proposal of the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish). There seems to be some disposition on the part of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), however I am certainly not in a position to give unanimous consent right now. If we could defer any such decision until we have had time to consult and decide exactly the form of the proposal, there might possibly be unanimous consent at a later time. Perhaps we could now return to the debate on the motions, and in the meantime we could discuss these issues and attempt to come up with something which is agreeable to all Hon. Members. Perhaps we could reach an agreement a little later.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. It is very difficult for me to give unanimous consent to extend the time length of the speeches of Members beyond ten minutes. If a Member cannot express himself in ten minutes, perhaps that Member should not be on his or her feet. I do not think the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) should get away with sloughing off all the blame on the NDP. Between those two Parties, they wasted two full days on the presentation of petitions, procedural wrangles and putting up speakers on one frivolous amendment after another. Now they want more time in which to debate, after wasting two full days of the House.

● (1900)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair did try to facilitate what Hon. Members appeared to be interested in. A point of order has to sound like a point of order, not a particular debate or attack on the Government. Let us keep to a point of order.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that I do have a point of order. If the Parliamentary Secretary is suggesting that the presentation of petitions, a time-honoured