

what is substantive about those motions and I am anxious to find out why they are considered substantive. I have not heard any reasons yet but have only heard the straight statement that they are substantive. I would like to know how, since when and why.

Those motions are not substantive. They were not substantive in committee, and, goodness knows, we discussed a whole series of motions for some period of time in committee. We had input from counsel for the committee, counsel for the Ministry of Transport, and we had the decision of the Chairman of the committee. We had discussion in debate, voted on the amendments and dealt with them one way or another.

The motions that are here now at report stage were moved in an attempt to continue to provide for a consolidation of definitions under Clause 2 so that the definitions are not scattered throughout the whole Bill.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my arguments have proved convincing. I hope that Hon. Members of the Official Opposition and Hon. Members on the Government side will agree that a great deal more has been made of this than was necessary in the first place. The very worthwhile and worthy Chairman of the committee felt that these motions needed to be dealt with, and we dealt with them. I am not sure if I won or if I lost on some, all or any of them, but that is not the point.

In committee, our legal advisers did not find these motions substantive. They said that there was no hard and fast rule as to where definitions should be located. There was agreement about that. Even though there may have been disagreement about the intent of my amendments, there was no disagreement about the fact that the definitions could be located anywhere in the Bill.

We are arguing that all of the definitions should be located in Clause 2 and that every clause thereafter should say, "as defined in Clause 2," which would create a simple, convenient, expedient and well drafted piece of legislation.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that certainly annoyed all the Members on the Opposition side, and even annoyed some of the Government Members in committee, was the fact that we were presented with a legislation that was poorly drafted in terms of its wording and the location of its words, leaving aside any substantive arguments about the Crow rate or anything else. The legislation was a botched-up job.

I certainly resented, and I believe that some of my colleagues in committee also resented, that we were trying to rewrite a Bill that the Government should have written properly itself before it was even presented to Parliament. The Government did not do that. It blew it. Once we got into the nitty-gritty of clause-by-clause examination of the Bill, I am sure the former Minister of Transport knows well that there must have been—and if there was not there should have been—some heads rolling in the legislative drafting department of the Department of Transport or perhaps the Justice Department. The drafting department simply did not do a good job, Mr. Speaker.

Western Grain Transportation Act

A great many of the amendments moved by my friend, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), and by myself were moved in an attempt to do two things. One was to get a piece of legislation that would be the kind that would be drafted if he were the Minister of Transport or to get a piece of legislation that would be the kind that would be drafted if I were the Minister of Transport. The other reason for a great many of his amendments and mine was to try to clean up the act of the Ministry. We were stuck with trying to rewrite legislation in a proper form with proper wording. That really should not be the job of the committee and would not be the job of the committee if, prior to the Bill being submitted, the Government had thoroughly considered it, instead of botching it up in a hurried attempt to meet deadlines of June 30, September 12 and Thanksgiving. I would like to tell the Government that if it meets a deadline set at Christmas 1984, it will be lucky.

The Government should stop setting deadlines because the more often it does so and does not meet that deadline, the more often it is dead. It was dead on June 30, September 12 and Thanksgiving weekend. Until it cleans up its act and is prepared to take certain steps with this legislation that Hon. Members of the Official Opposition and my Party may not agree with, it will not meet the Remembrance Day weekend deadline and it will not meet the Christmas deadline.

Every once in a while, there is an exception to the rule. Most of the time, Parties in Opposition know and understand that the Government has the right to govern and it has the right to pass its legislation. In the overwhelming majority of cases of legislation, that happens. Opposition Parties will oppose, will propose and will vote against legislation, but the Government passes 95 per cent of its legislation. However, once in awhile a piece of legislation will come forward that is an exception to this rule, and this is one of those pieces of legislation.

I remind the former Minister of Transport that his predecessor tried to pilot the first grain stabilization Bill through the House. The Government ended up with egg on its face and had to withdraw the Bill. If it had not been for the Opposition Members and eventually even Members on the Government side saying that this was a dumb piece of legislation, we would have been stuck with a grain stabilization Bill that was worse than the one we finally got. The one we finally got is so bad that if one were to apply the same principle to the Unemployment Insurance Act, the person who worked full time would collect the most money. If one were to apply the same principle to the medicare Act, the person who never got sick would collect the most money. That is what we got out of the Government when it passed a Bill that it did not know anything about, and the same is true for this Bill.

Government Members got all excited about Motion No. 2 which proposes a minor amendment, and even the Chair got excited about it. Even the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) got excited about it, and I do not understand why. If the Government will not learn from previous history, it is condemned to repeat history, and that is exactly what it is doing.