

The Administrator, on behalf of the Minister, may enter into agreements to provide for the movement of grain by motor vehicle transport where, in his opinion, such agreements would be in the best interest of the grain producers.

**The amendment reads:**

—but such agreements shall not provide for the movement of grain by motor vehicle transport from shipping points on rail lines which have not been abandoned by order of the Canadian Transport Commission.

That makes it impossible, Mr. Speaker, for the Administrator to have grain hauled by truck from an elevator where a rail line is operational. If you were to review the arguments of many Conservative Members over the last couple of days, as I did to some extent, I am sure you would find that in arguing against Motion No. 34 they put up a good number of arguments in favour of Motion No. 35. So I am sure that we will have the support of the Conservatives for this particular amendment.

For example, the Hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Cooper) thoroughly explained the need for trucking in his area of the country where there are no railways. I submit that Motion No. 34 would not have made any difference to his particular situation because if there are no railways, trucking must be and will continue to be used. It was a little difficult to follow his arguments on that basis.

I also noted that the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) spoke about the irrelevance of the arguments of the NDP and was himself—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member. However, I should remind him that the House has come to a decision relative to Motion No. 34 and the debate on that motion should not carry on any longer. His comments must now be addressed to Motion No. 35 which is before the House.

**Mr. Hovdebo:** Mr. Speaker, the two motions are so intertwined that it is impossible to eliminate a reference to one without the other. We have not voted on Motion No. 34 so we have to assume that it is still there.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** No. I am sorry, that is not the way things should be considered. For all practical purposes the House has left Motion No. 34. It is quite true that the determining outcome of that will occur at the time of the recorded vote. However, in a sense, there has been a preliminary determination. A voice vote has taken place.

● (1230)

However, there must be a clear distinction that what we are now debating is no longer Motion No. 34 but, rather, Motion No. 35. It is contrary to proper procedure, to logic itself, to come back to Motion No. 34 at this time. The Hon. Member, if he so wishes, if I may be helpful, may bring forward any argument he wishes, but if he keeps on relating to Motion No. 34, he is clearly out of order. I invite him to proceed with Motion No. 35.

**Mr. Hovdebo:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I recognize your ruling.

*Western Grain Transportation Act*

**Mr. Evans:** Do you understand?

**Mr. Fisher:** Will you live by it?

**Mr. Hovdebo:** In discussion on Motion No. 35, what we are attempting to do is to ensure that the clause which is being amended, Clause 17(4), cannot be used to assist the railways, the CTC and the Government of Canada in the abandonment of railway branch lines. Clause 17(4) could obviously be used by the railways in the process of abandonment. This particular clause will ensure that Clause 17(4) cannot be used for the abandonment of railways.

Even now, in many parts of Canada, in many parts of the Prairies, movement of grain by truck is being used to assist the abandonment of railways. For instance, in my constituency is the Carleton line, which is a short line just north of Saskatoon going into the Prince Albert district. The Carleton line has been partially abandoned but is still operating to some extent. Last week I received a number of calls concerning the line from farmers who said that they are not getting cars and, therefore, the grain is being trucked from those elevators to Saskatoon or to a main line. Therefore, when we review the abandonment of that line next year, the CNR will say: "Look, we did not move the 60,000 tonnes required to keep the line in business and, consequently, we will have to abandon it."

The amendment would disallow the Administrator, the CTC and the CNR the right to use trucking as a method of abandoning the lines. So, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Flis:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Flis) is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Flis:** I know you have been very lenient, Mr. Speaker, with the New Democratic Party speakers, but we are discussing Clause 17 which has to do with the duties and functions of the Administrator. There is nothing in Clause 17(4) that refers to abandonment or even suggests that it would lead to abandonment. The NDP moved Motion No. 35 and, as Your Honour ruled earlier, I wish its Members would stick to Motion No. 35 as it relates to Clause 17(4). All we have heard from speaker after speaker is "abandonment", which has nothing to do with the duties and functions of the Administrator.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order. The Hon. Member for Prince Albert heard the Parliamentary Secretary's comment. I am in the middle, and I must come to some kind of judgment. The Chair, in terms of relevancy of remarks concerning the amendments at report stage, has time and time again invited a number of Hon. Members to make an effort at least to demonstrate to the Chair in what way their remarks are related to the amendments. Once again, I would invite the Hon. Member for Prince Albert to do just that.

**Mr. Hovdebo:** Mr. Speaker, I could make a considerable argument on that particular point, but just to bring the