

*Western Grain Transportation Act*

intent, meaning or substance of the Bill? I do not believe it is a surprising proposition, Madam Speaker, because it is one which has been requested by Hon. Members in the Opposition. I believe the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) in debate on March 2 introduced the idea into second reading debate at that particular point in time. The acceptance in principle was announced by my predecessor on May 4. The text of the amendment was released and circulated to Members of the House on May 31 during second reading and was not acceptable at that time because of that. But it was introduced, so it was fair notice. Certainly during the course of the committee hearings many witnesses endorsed and supported the idea of a safety net. The question is, does it in fact in any way run counter to the intent of the Bill or does it enhance it? I would make the case that it is very clearly within the context of the Bill, because not only does the Bill provide for compensation to the railways, it has a number of clauses deemed to be acceptable which provide protection for the farmers against loss of income. There is the limit on the farmers' share of cost increases over the years through a 3-3-3-6 formula. There are various amendments which deal with performance guarantees from the railways to ensure a degree of protection for farmers. There is the railway investment guarantee. There is a key clause, which has been accepted as part of a motion, dealing with the establishment of review machinery which would take place as soon as the Bill is passed. This is designed to look at methods of payment and the way in which it impacts on farmers' income and performance.

● (1640)

So there are a number of parts of this Bill which have as the principle the protection of farmers' income and their ability to pay. This is a sort of additional clause to enhance that particular area. I recognize that it is a substantial amendment, no question about that, but I do believe it lies within the course of these amendments. I not only recommend it to yourself, Madam Speaker, but obviously to other Members of the House. I believe it will be generally endorsed as further protection for the grain producer.

Motion No. 74, which you also ruled out, is really consequential to Motion No. 157. It is a way of adding to the actual amount of Government compensation to take into account the question of a safety net. So if you accept Motion No. 157, then Motion No. 74 would follow on it.

I want to speak briefly to Motion No. 152, Madam Speaker, in the name of the Hon. Member for Kenora-Rainy River. As you have said, it proposes a new scheme not contemplated in the Bill. The substance has some attraction. It is in a sense a living experiment of an alternative method of payment to producers. This is not the time to debate the policy implications but rather the motion's procedural acceptability. The Government finds itself in agreement with the Speaker's ruling that it is not within the boundaries of the Bill according to the rules of procedure, even though the substance may be worth examination at some point in time.

I might conclude by speaking to the amendment put forward by the Progressive Conservatives, particularly Motion No. 10, the definition of "export" put forward by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight). This was the subject of some interesting debate during examination here and in committee. I would not want to comment on its procedural acceptability. That is really within your purview. But I would indicate that if it is ultimately ruled out of order, the Government would be prepared to give consent to introduce it, as we consider it favourably and are in agreement with it. So if it is ruled out of order, we would be prepared to accept it by unanimous agreement because it does enhance the Bill.

On the question of Motion No. 57, presented by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), the so-called British Columbia Railway amendment, I would simply point out that if it presents procedural difficulties, then Government Motion No. 56 addresses the same issue. I believe that has been accepted by the Speaker, although the Hon. Member may want to address this matter, or perhaps his House leader. I think Motion No. 156 is the same as Motion No. 57 and will have the same impact and consequences.

Those are the comments I have concerning procedural matters, and I thank the Hon. Members for their time.

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Madam Speaker, this is a rather unique arrangement. Let me say just briefly and perhaps my House leader may want to comment further—I think the Minister is right with respect to Motion No. 14. The definition of "grain" is really consequential upon Motion No. 164, which would give the Governor in Council the power to add additional grains under the statutory freight rate regime. I believe my colleagues and I would have no difficulty with that.

Regarding Motion No. 157, while it is true that this is not a new issue—it was injected into debate by the former Minister of Transport and, for all intents and purposes, was considered to be an integral part of this legislation—the committee had difficulty debating this issue because of its procedural unacceptability. I am pleased that the distinguished Chairman of that committee is in the House today. We regret very much that we were not able to discuss this matter because it was something committee Members clearly wanted to debate. The principle is perhaps acceptable, but I am not sure whether the detail is acceptable. While we are sympathetic to the inclusion of Motion No. 157, I would think that in its present form we would have some difficulty with the detail. That is not to say that we are not prepared to discuss it at a later point. Perhaps there can be some agreement reached, so I will leave that open.

With respect to Government Motion No. 156 and the provision to include other railway companies under the provisions of this Act, and Motion No. 57 standing in my name, I think the Minister is correct. Those two motions have the same intent, and to the extent the Government's amendment is found in order, I would certainly have no difficulty in accepting the suggestion made by the Minister in support of the Government's motion. I think that for all intent and purposes