

these considerations into account in making the firm ruling so that there will be an opportunity to debate this particular matter of the Crow's Nest Act and the amendments thereto.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order to respond to the preliminary ruling of the Chair this morning. I would like to confine my remarks to the grouping of Motions Nos. 2 to 19. It seems to me that it is very difficult to deal in an over-all manner with so many motions. That is basically why I rise. The reasons for ruling motions out of order are fairly straightforward. They usually fall into three or four categories. A motion is usually ruled out of scope, or is proposing a substantive change in the intent of the Bill. Also, motions are occasionally ruled out of order because of financial restraints. They cannot interfere with the Royal prerogative of deciding what sort of expenditures may be made. Another reason which is often put forward is that the motion is contrary to the purpose of the Bill.

I am having great difficulty with the announcement presented to us by the Speaker yesterday, as it applied to Motions Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Even though the Chair in its ruling did indicate that some of these motions involved a simple transfer of definitions from Part II and Part III of the Bill forward to Clause 2 which offers definitions for the entire Bill, I fail to understand from the ruling of the Chair how this was out of order. I would like some further clarification on those particular motions because, I remind the Chair, those motions used exactly the same wording that is in the Bill. They do not change the wording. The fact that the spot in the Bill has changed does not change the meaning. It simply makes for a neater Bill. The attempt is to put all of the definitions in the initial part. Clause 2 begins "In this Act," and goes on to state the definitions and what those definitions shall mean. Part II and Part III begin, in each case, "In this Part", and go on to outline those definitions.

I would remind the Chair, therefore, that Motion No. 2 is simply a transfer from Clause 34 forward to Clause 2. Motion No. 3 has again exactly the same wording, being transferred from Clause 54 forward to the appropriate place in Clause 2. Motion No. 4 again has the same wording, being transferred from Clause 54 to Clause 2. Therefore, we have a clear definition Clause in the Bill. Similarly, Motion No. 5 has the same wording one finds in Clause 34. The proposal is to transfer it under the definitions clause. As well, Motion No. 6 has the same wording as appears in the Bill in Clause 54. The same is true of Motion No. 7 which has the same wording one would find in Clause 54. So there is no change in the intent of the Bill. There is no change to the financial requirements and to the scope of the Bill. Nor, would I argue, is it contrary to the purpose and intent of the Bill. I fail to see, therefore, why those particular motions have been ruled out of order, given the reasons stated in the preliminary ruling which was presented to this House yesterday.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I would like to deal with the preliminary rulings made by the Chair relative to the group of

Western Grain Transportation Act

Motions Nos. 20 to 23, 28, 36, 41, 54, 57, 80, 81, 85, 89 and 166 going beyond the scope of the Bill. Considering that we have nothing at all in the title of the Bill which deals with the Dominion coal lands, I can accept, perhaps, that Motion No. 20 is not within the scope of the Bill. However, the portion of the Bill dealing with Dominion coal lands has been accepted. Therefore, it is quite obviously within the scope of the Bill. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Kootenay-East Revelstoke (Mr. Parker) will deal with this subject more thoroughly, but I will say that Motion No. 20 should be recognized as well within the scope of the Bill since this Bill, although it does not say so in the title or in the preamble, does take into consideration those Dominion coal lands.

Motions Nos. 21 and 22 also are amendments dealing with the amount of money which is going to be paid to the railways. It seems quite logical to me, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some give and take in this matter. Is this Bill intended only to decide how much money is going to be given to the CPR or to the CNR, and it will not impose any requirements on those corporations in return? We require service in return. If they do not fulfil that service, we should put some penalties on them. Motion No. 22 really establishes penalties which should be levied against Canadian Pacific Railway if it accepts certain funds without providing the service which is needed.

• (1630)

Motion No. 28, Mr. Speaker, is also in that group. Again, Madam Speaker suggested that the motion was out of the scope of the Bill. I ask that you review that because all it is really doing is establishing the membership of certain groups which have a great deal to do with the Bill. Therefore, it would seem to me that adding or deleting members of that group would be quite within the scope of the Bill.

I think Madam Speaker's definition of "scope" takes in a lot of territory. If the mention of the coal lands, for example, is acceptable and we pass that as part of the Bill, then there is no reason why we cannot amend that part of the Bill which deals with the coal lands in Clause 20.

I also want to spend a couple of minutes on the second grouping, namely Motions Nos. 2 to 19 inclusive, including Motions Nos. 59, 64, 66, and so on. All of these amendments are housekeeping motions to make the Bill more clear as far as the public is concerned. Being a layman and having to refer to these kinds of Acts of Parliament quite often during my life, I always found it valuable to know exactly where the definitions were so that I did not have to spend a lot of time going to other parts of the Bill to find out what the particular definitions were.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Before I recognize the next speaker on a point of order, the House has given a considerable amount of time to examining the Speaker's tentative rulings. We do not have rules which specify how much time can be used by an Hon. Member on a point of order. Yet at the same time there is a responsibility on the part of the Chair to attempt to assist in bringing matters forward. I gave a great length of time particularly to the Hon. Member for