

are arguing today. What we are arguing today is that it is appropriate that it be placed before the House of Commons.

Motion No. 36 and Motion No. 41 are consequential amendments and flow from Motion No. 18. If my argument on Motion No. 18 is acceptable, then I would argue that the arguments on Motions Nos. 36 and 41 are equally acceptable. They limit and narrow the scope of the Administrator to oversee only the railroads.

● (1240)

Mr. Benjamin: I beg your pardon; I am wrong.

Mr. Deans: My colleague now tells me he is wrong, so I will go back to it.

Mr. Benjamin: It was not No. 29 that was deferred.

Mr. Deans: In any event, I will come back to that. Motions Nos. 36 and 41 should be in order, just as Motion No. 18 should be in order. Again, I do not see how it could not be the prerogative of the House of Commons to offer amendments which narrow the scope of an Administrator who is to be defined in the Act and given responsibility for administering this Act. It may be that it is politically unacceptable. It may not fall within the view of the governing Party, or even the Official Opposition, that the administrative function should be narrow, but in our view it should be. We are not altering in any way the clear mandate set out in the long title; neither are we increasing the charge to the public purse. We are simply saying that the responsibilities which have been given to the Administrator are too broad and we would like to narrow them down a little. Perhaps we would like to narrow them down substantially, but the decision about whether or not they should be narrowed down is not a decision of admissibility, surely, it is a decision of politics, and we would argue that that is in fact the case.

I would go back for a moment to Motion No. 28. What we have said is that the Grain Transportation Committee should be made up somewhat differently from what the Government has suggested. We are not saying it should not exist, because we know we could vote against it. We are not saying there should be an additional charge on the public treasury, because it will be made up of similar numbers. We are saying it should be made up differently, that the participation in the actual committee itself should be a different participation from the one offered by the Government.

It seems to this Party that that is a legitimate matter for debate. It is not a question of rewriting the Bill, of deviating from the long title or charging to the Government substantial new sums of money. At the moment I am sure the Government does not know exactly how much the Grain Transportation Committee will cost in any event. That is going to be very difficult to determine at this point in time because the cost will fluctuate. We are suggesting that an amendment to the numbers, and as to who should participate as full members, is surely clearly within the scope of the Bill. It is clearly within the definitions envisaged by the long title and is certainly not

Western Grain Transportation Act

an infringement on the financial prerogatives of the Government as contained in the Royal Recommendation.

We would argue, therefore, that that amendment, again like the others, should be decided here. It is up to the Government if it does not want it, but it is certainly legitimate to say that instead of having a representative from this place, there should be a representative from another place, and that is what we are saying. We believe that motion should be considered and allowed to stand.

Motions Nos. 67 and 70 are consequential again and will depend upon your ruling on Motion No. 19. I just bring that to Your Honour's attention.

Motion No. 89 is a substantive motion in the sense that it is difficult to explain. Perhaps I might, if you will allow me, have my colleague from Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) explain exactly how that works, if that is acceptable. It will not take my colleague a great deal of time, but the subject is technical. I do not want to pretend for one moment that every technical part of this Bill is carefully tucked away in my memory; it is not.

Motion No. 151 brings in the question again of the British Columbia Railway and whether or not it should be considered as part of the grain transportation system. I suggest that quite clearly it is a part of the transportation system for the movement of grain. It is already a part of the transportation system for the movement of grain. The Bill purports to be an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain. It cannot be done properly without the British Columbia Railway being seen to be part of it.

We are suggesting, first of all, that our amendment is not beyond the scope of the Bill. Being beyond the scope would take it completely out of the question as to whether or not it deals with the transportation, shipping and handling of grain. We contend further that it would not cost money. Therefore, in that way it does not fall outside the Royal Recommendation. We are trying to spread the benefit available, if you will, among the farmers to the shippers who are legitimately in the business of shipping western grain. They are not going to ship any more grain if the British Columbia Railway is included; they will still ship the same amount. Therefore, the charge on the public treasury will be no more than the charge is today. We are suggesting, however, that since the British Columbia Railway is legitimately part of the over-all and integrated railroad system, transporting grain on the British Columbia Railway should be seen as acceptable within the terminology and definitions of this legislation.

I reinforce the point by asking this: If we are going to ship grain in western Canada—and I do not know what the amount will be—how will we ship it? It does not alter the amount we ship; the amount we ship is determined by the marketplace. If it is shipped on Canadian Pacific or Canadian National, it qualifies under this legislation. If it is shipped on the British Columbia Railway, it does not. We suggest that this is a political decision. This motion is clearly within the scope of the Bill. It is clearly not an infringement on the Royal Recommendation. It is, therefore, clearly in order.