

Transportation

to Port Arthur over any lines of railway of the company, and so on and so forth.

The purpose of moving this amendment would be to give protection to all the rates that are not directly protected by statute but which are generally called the Crowsnest Pass related rates.

I would also like to be permitted to include provision for renumbering new section 472 and my previous amendment related to domestic rates with respect to British Columbia as new section 471. There was never any dispute with relation to it and it is obviously not in contradiction to anything done up until now.

The effect of accepting this amendment would be to protect all these related rates that are not directly protected by statute. It involves an absolutely direct reversal of the position taken by the house last week and would therefore, under the Speaker's ruling, be even more out of order than the amendment I moved previously. That is why I am saying that I hope I would have unanimous consent. It was certainly never the intention of the government at any time to endanger in any way the rates on any of these grain products that are related to the Crowsnest pass rates.

I appeal to hon. members to overlook the fact that the house took an opposite view on this matter last Wednesday and unanimously to allow me to move my amendment. I am not asking that it be accepted by the committee but, if I had unanimous consent, when we come to clause 74 I could move it because we would have got over any possible procedural difficulty.

Mr. Rapp: Does the minister's proposed amendment mean that rapeseed will be classified as grain?

Mr. Pickersgill: The amendment would include rapeseed and every other grain or grain product that up until now has been protected because of orders of the board or decisions of the railways related to the Crowsnest pass rates. The Crowsnest pass rates are protected in new section 328 in clause 50. This proposed amendment would provide protection for all these related rates. I do not think any of us wanted to take that protection away. All I am seeking to do is get over the rules of the house, which I do not seek to invoke against anybody else merely because they were invoked against me, in order to make sure that this protection, which is so important to the western farmers, continues to be afforded to them.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the minister for the rapidity with which he was able to produce another amendment within about 20 minutes of the Speaker's ruling against the previous one. But now that we have it in our hands I would suggest to the minister that rather than asking us at this moment to give unanimous consent, which may subsequently be given, we should have an opportunity to study it because we have to go back to the various sections of the Railway Act. A little later today the minister might repeat his suggestion and perhaps at that stage unanimous consent would be forthcoming.

In saying this I am not doubting that this is an accurate proposition. I am simply asking that we have a little time to study it. The amendment occupies a foolscap page and we want to consult on it. Subject to studying it I think I can say that we will be in agreement with the minister's suggestion because, as I stated previously when I moved to strike out new section 329, I anticipated that something would be substituted somewhere in the bill dealing with the definition of grain products. I thought it might be done in the interpretation clause. The minister has produced a version which we may find to be quite satisfactory, but I ask him to let us study it for a while and renew his request a little later today.

● (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Pickersgill: If the exact terms of my amendment are not satisfactory, I think that once we get over the problem of unanimous consent and have them properly before us there could be a further amendment then if anyone wishes to move it. I should not wish to be unreasonable and therefore I am quite prepared, if we can go on and make some progress on clause 1 and perhaps even pass it, to move the other amendment which we had at the beginning and which relates to new section 468A. I do not think I need ask for unanimous consent in that regard. It is true that my whole amendment was ruled out of order, but this part of it in which there are technical amendments was not even mentioned. It certainly has not been considered before. All it does is correct an error or a couple of errors, one in printing and one which is very little more than a grammatical error. It is very important, however, that this should be done. I would hope it could be understood at this stage that there would be no objection to this. It is identical to the first part of the other amendment, that is, it starts