

Transportation

pass freight rates. The Crowsnest pass freight rates by agreement have become law. Therefore the minister must be referring to the Crowsnest pass freight rates when defining statutory rates.

When the minister referred to statutory rates last night he said they included other rates but indicated he did not know what they were because the statutes had been amended. We all know that apart from the Crowsnest pass freight rates, statutory rates represent an infinitesimal amount of railway revenue. The minister's explanation in this regard is nothing but hogwash.

We have suggested to the minister over and over again that he is pitting the western farmer against the other taxpayers of Canada. Surely that will be the result of his attempt to amend this clause. Canada is the only wheat exporting nation in the world which does not subsidize the farmer for his wheat. Parliament has thrown out the section but the minister now wants to give this baby another bath.

I ask the minister to withdraw his amendment at this point. Failing that I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to rule the amendment out of order on the ground that it violates a fundamental rule of the house to the effect that a question having been once moved and carried in the affirmative or negated cannot be put again but must remain as the judgment of this house.

Let us examine the language of the proposed amendment. It states in part:

—the commission to investigate the revenues and costs attributable to the carriage of any commodity by the company at a statutory rate or substituted rate.

This involves a matter of semantics. It obviously refers to the Crowsnest pass rates. Old section 329 and clause 74 as proposed by the amendment are identical, mean the same thing and would result in the same thing. The investigation would be the same and the decision would be the same. All the minister is really saying is that the defeat of the government in the vote has put him in an embarrassing and difficult position. It is my impression that the minister has made some deal with the railway and as a result of his defeat has let the railways down. He is not sure now how to get off the hook but is attempting to do so by violating a rule. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to rule that this amendment is invalid and unacceptable at this time.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Pickersgill: I should like to reply immediately to those parts of the hon. gentleman's remarks which deal with the rules. Those parts of the speech relating to my reputation I will simply ignore until a later time.

There was a considerable debate held in respect of new section 329 during our consideration of clause 50. That debate took place before the vote on that section. As the hon. gentleman quite rightly pointed out, the committee decided that the section should be stricken from the bill. I suppose I could take the technical position, sir, that the question of order should have been raised immediately, but I do not take that position.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is not so.

Mr. Pickersgill: There was a debate on it, and during the debate the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre indicated quite clearly that in moving the amendment to strike the whole clause he had counted on me to produce other amendments which would repair any damage that might have been done. This, of course, is precisely what I was seeking to do in this amendment. If anyone will fairly examine all the debate, and particularly examine the very learned observations of the learned and hon. member for York South which will be found on pages 11958 and 11959 of *Hansard*, and examine the arguments of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, the hon. member for Acadia and the hon. member for Peace River, I think it will be found the objection everyone took to proposed section 329 was not to any of the ancillary features such as the inclusion of the definition of types of grain and grain products, which in order to have an adequate bill need to be included somewhere, but to the provision for a mandatory review.

This is what I referred to as "the baby" and what I understood the hon. member for Macleod was referring to as "the baby". I thought what he meant by the "bath water" was what I have not made any attempt to ask the committee to reverse itself upon. My understanding was that the principle in the clause to which hon. members objected was that there was to be a mandatory review of revenues and costs in regard to these rates on grain whether or not anyone asked for it.

Mr. Woolliams: No, no, that is wrong.

Mr. Churchill: That was only one objection.