

*Western Grain Transportation Act*

should like to elaborate on some of the reasons why we would like to support the motion if it can be found to be in order—and we think it is in order.

• (1115)

I think the way the Bill stands indicates that the motion is admissible. The Government has made commitments for the next three years on branch line rehabilitation. There is no change in the Royal Recommendation with respect to the expenditure of funds.

Without presuming to say whether Motion No. 33 will pass or not, we know there is a recommendation for the retention of branch lines to the year 2000 and that exchanges of branch lines have been required by the Canadian Transport Commission to be extended to the year 2000. An example is the CN takeover from CP on the Matador sub in my part of the country, and the Dodsland sub with the reverse taking place. Those transfers cannot take place until the rehabilitation has been completed.

We would like to see this motion put because it would be consistent with the rulings of the CTC and the expressed desire of the Government that those transfers should take place. As things stand, they cannot take place until the lines have been rehabilitated or upgraded. Therefore, the requirement in the Bill for that that to take place does not change the intent or the Royal prerogative. It only puts into legislation something that would make the people who use the branch lines feel more secure than they would if it rested in an order in council or some other place. I hope that, in considering Motion No. 51 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West, the Chair will consider the statements of the Government and the fact that this does not in any way change the intent of the Government with regard to Bill C-155.

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to discuss the ruling made on Motion No. 89 which was referred to my colleague, the House Leader of this Party.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order, please. I am sure the Hon. Member appreciates that he is not questioning a ruling but a preliminary ruling. We are still discussing the general matter in that spirit, naturally.

**Mr. Althouse:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I had temporarily forgotten the word "preliminary". We have been discussing a preliminary ruling in the last day or so. The point I was making referred to the preliminary ruling on Motion No. 89. The preliminary assessment was that it was considered to be beyond the scope of the Bill.

I would remind the Chair that the Bill deals with the transportation of western grain. Motion No. 89 is a motion to clarify in that it describes what is and what has been the current practice. The motion itself is consistent with current practice regarding the rates for rapeseed and canola beyond Thunder Bay. Those rates are currently set at a minimum compensatory rate under Section 23 of the National Transpor-

tation Act. In committee the shippers expressed concern that, as it stands, the Bill may leave the impression that those rates would no longer be applicable. We are therefore anxious to have the Bill make clear that the rate provisions now available to them would still be available for shipment beyond Thunder Bay. In fairness, I think that is the intent of the Government.

During consideration of the Bill we heard many arguments from Members of the Government and the Minister to the effect that one of the secondary purposes of the Bill is to encourage processing in western Canada. The maintenance of these minimum compensatory rates would assist in this. I believe, therefore, that the title of the Bill, "an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain", should be interpreted broadly enough to include rapeseed and canola oil, and for clarification purposes the policy outlined in Motion No. 89 should be described in the Bill, so that what is now in effect can continue and the producers of those particular products in western Canada will continue to be treated on a basis consistent with what has been the case up until this point in time.

• (1120)

I suggest that the Chair review its initial ruling to call this particular motion beyond the scope of the Bill. Given these circumstances, I hope you will find that it is indeed within the scope of the Bill and should be allowed to be debated.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I would like to add to what my colleague, the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre, has said on Motion No. 89. The intent of the motion is to continue the present practice. I would again like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that this does not exceed the Royal Recommendation and it does not go beyond the scope of the Bill, which says it is "to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain".

Without Motion No. 89 Mr. Speaker, the intent of this legislation can be thwarted. Without this motion the intent of the Bill could be prevented from being carried out. That is the reason for the motion. We endeavoured to word the motion carefully so as to remain within the two bounds which must guide us on motions at report stage—that it does not exceed the Royal Recommendation and that it stays within the scope of the legislation. Surely, the scope of the legislation is the facilitation of the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain. Without this motion, Sir, the intent and scope of this legislation can be prevented in the case of a number of grains which move to eastern Canada either raw or processed. Certainly, it was obvious in committee from all sides that this was one area which needed to be addressed in this legislation, so that the intent of the legislation could be completely carried out. Therefore, Sir, I ask you to consider this additional point raised by myself in the course of the consideration by the Chair and by the officials in reaching a final ruling. I urge this motion be considered in order.

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I would simply want to support the