

two Hon. Members who have just spoken with respect to the admissibility of Motion No. 89.

There are two points which I want to make very quickly, Mr. Speaker. My first point relates to facilitating the movement of grain. As "grain" is described under the interpretation clause of the Bill, it is clear that the production of rapeseed or canola oil are included within the context of this Bill. Those products should be included when dealing with the movement, collection and handling of grain. Therefore, it really does not go beyond the scope of the Bill in so far as the definition of the product is concerned.

Second, if there should be any suggestion that it goes beyond the Royal Recommendation, I would simply like to say to you, Sir, that in my humble view it does not. What this motion is really asking for is the retention of the status quo on the freight rate beyond Thunder Bay, namely the minimum compensatory freight rate which is established by a formula through the Canadian Transport Commission. The amendment seeks to ensure the retention of that rate, because quite frankly with rapeseed and canola considered as grains under the statutory freight rate regime, it would move at the statutory freight rate from any point in western Canada to Thunder Bay and beyond that at a commercial rate. So the net effect on those two products would be perhaps worse than it was before. All this motion will do is compel the railway to prescribe a minimum compenstory rate beyond the Port of Thunder Bay. That in no way affects the Royal prerogative or the money package included in this Bill. I think that point has to be made abundantly clear.

● (1125)

To reiterate, if you are talking about the broad concept of the Bill, and since it appears the statement of purpose I so eloquently described is under attack, it is fair to say that one can only rely upon the broad title, which is an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain. Processed canola and rapeseed is classified as a grain.

So on those two counts, Mr. Speaker, the Royal prerogative, and qualification within the content and purpose of the Bill, I think this motion qualifies on both counts.

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, and I see the Parliamentary Secretary and the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport here, if the Allan Report had been made available to the Committee as we had requested, in all likelihood there would have been more amendments similar to Motion No. 89. That report was a study done by the Government which directly reflected what my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), has expressed on the ramifications of this motion. If the report was available to you, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you would be able to see that it does not in any way affect the Royal prerogative.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I am afraid the Hon. Member is discussing the relative merits of the substance of

Western Grain Transportation Act

the amendment, not its procedural acceptability in the strict sense of the word. I invite him to address himself to that point.

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, that brief statement of purpose was so that Table officers and you, Sir, could ask for something we have been unable to obtain, the Allan report, which would allow them to reflect clearly on your judgment to be made on Motion No. 89, as to whether it is admissible and, within the Royal prerogative, whether it changes the intent of the Bill and its interpretation of grain as put forward by my colleague for Vegreville or the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), and whether that interpretation in any way, shape or form changes the intent of the Bill. That is the reason I was addressing myself to that report. It has not been available to members of the Standing Committee on Transport, but it may be made available to you, Sir.

● (1130)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The House will now proceed with debate, resuming consideration of Motion No. 33. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-North (Mr. Orlikow).

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, while we have been debating the Bill for some weeks now, I could not help but think of last Thursday afternoon when we heard the very eloquent speeches of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Leader of the Official Opposition and the Leader of the New Democratic Party about how they foresaw Canada in the future as being a democratic, tolerant country in which the people who helped form this country, with its two official languages, would have equal rights. I could not help but think that none of that could have been made possible—in fact, we would not have had a country—if the Fathers of Confederation had not been far-seeing and daring enough to ensure that a railway was built from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Any person who looks at a map of North America will realize that the economic line in this continent runs not east to west, but, rather, north to south. The people of Vancouver have much more in common with the people of Los Angeles and San Francisco than they have with those in Ottawa. The people of Halifax have much more in common with the people of Boston, New York and Philadelphia than they do with those in Winnipeg. The people in Winnipeg have much more in common with the people of Minnesota and Minneapolis than they have with those in Halifax. Therefore, without the railway there would not have been a country.

Sir John A. Macdonald gave all the support necessary, and that meant tens of millions of dollars and millions of acres of land, to the promoters who built the CPR. Then certain other businessmen who thought they could make a profit started to develop other railways. Eventually, we had not two railways but, rather, at least five railways. We had the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk Northern, and several other railways.

Then it was realized that we had overbuilt railways and that they could not manage financially. They certainly could not all operate and make a profit. If they had not already become