

trench by trench, trying in every way possible to stop what those opposite are going to do to the people whom we represent. Finally, I have come to the last ditch. I have no more place to fall back. The House has put on closure. The deal has been made. We know what the final outcome will be.

When I speak to Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49, I am basically saying that I have come to the last ditch, as others in my Party have done. I hope people will remember that as far as we could, we put up a good fight to save the Crow for the people we represent.

The motions now before the House are directed to the procedure for reviewing regulations proposed by the Administrator of the Grain Transportation Agency. A mouthful of words like that cannot mean very much to somebody who has not been following this debate word for word. Perhaps they would not mean much to somebody who has. The motions before the House are important. What they amount to is how this whole massive new Bill will operate, who will operate it, and who will call upon the Administrator to see that this Bill will be put into operation.

The motions before the House now deal particularly with the regulations and who can bring them in. As Hon. Members are aware, the first motion talks about the way the Bill is written to request changes in the regulations. It states regulations can be brought in by 15 Senators or 30 Members of Parliament. It is almost an insult to think that somebody would write a Bill like that.

Who represents the people of this country? Is it the Senators who got their seat by failing in a couple of elections, being a good fund raiser or for any of the different reasons that Senators get their seats, or is it the Members of Parliament, those who have gone out in the line, put up their name, stood and fought and presented themselves in such a way that a number of people in a constituency said that that is the person they want to represent them?

How could it possibly be that anybody writing a piece of legislation would make it sound as if a Member of Parliament only had half the wits of a Senator? I do not know what that means, half the wits of a Senator, but it is not very much. However, that is what the motion says. What we want to do in the motion is to make it equal, that 15 Members of Parliament would have the same weight in bringing about a request for reviewing regulations as 15 Senators would have. That would clearly be understood by all who understand the parliamentary procedure of our House of Commons.

The other motions have to do with the whole idea of closure and time allocation when the committee reports to the House. In Motion No. 49, my Party says there should not be closure. That has been demonstrated very clearly and very well by all Members on this side of the House and, in due course, will be demonstrated by Members of the other side. It is an insult to Members of Parliament that they do not have a place for debate. Closure will be automatically applied on debate. There will not be an open debate on regulations, which could be very complicated. There will be great complication in how the regulations will be put forward and how the procedures

Western Grain Transportation Act

regarding the regulations will be put forward, as well as the penalty that will be used in the grain trade when people do not keep to the regulations.

This is very complicated material. The Government is bringing in closure as a prearranged device to keep Members of Parliament who are responsible from debating the Bill in the House of Commons. I hope the Government will be willing to see that Motion No. 49 is carried, that the motion will be brought forward in such a way that this House of Commons will not plan closure even before the event has taken place.

My point in this last ditch stand is that it is a rather sad moment. I really felt in this process that the Government would see what the people of western Canada were asking for and would have some kind of feeling and sensitivity with regard to their request that this regulation, which we have come to know as the Crow, which is part and parcel of the lives of western Canadians, be respected. Like the warriors who have finally gone from trench to trench and put up a good fight but have not been able to carry the day and who are now in their last ditch stand, I hope that that will be appreciated and understood by the people whom we represent.

• (1630)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the debate on this. I listened to the Hon. Member's comments with some interest. This morning the Hon. Member for Kootenay West (Mr. Kristiansen) raised the same issue, that only 15 Senators would be required to precipitate a debate whereas it would require 30 Members of the House of Commons to precipitate a debate. Irrespective of what the Members in the New Democratic Party feel about the Senate, we have to all agree that they are Members of Parliament. They have a function to play in Parliament. They play a very useful role as a Chamber of sober second thought.

Apart from that, we should recognize that after the current redistribution or changes which are now before us with regard to the number of Members of Parliament who are to be in this House, we will have 310 Members of Parliament. Thirty Members represents about 10 percent of the House of Commons whereas 15 Senators out of 104 represents 14 per cent of the Senate. If we assume that the Senate has a role to play then it seems to me that to require roughly proportional equality with regard to the number of Members or Senators who would be required to precipitate a debate would be fair. Indeed, the legislation bends over backwards and gives the House of Commons the right to a debate when only 10 per cent of the Members so require, whereas it requires 14 per cent of the Senators to precipitate such a debate. Contrary to the views that are being expressed by the Members of the New Democratic Party, the House of Commons is put in an advantageous position. Perhaps that is by virtue of the fact that we are elected Members and they are appointed, but it is easier to precipitate a debate on this issue under this amendment by the House of Commons than it is in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would point that out to Hon. Members and perhaps