

acceptable, then both should be acceptable. If one is ruled out, then I concede that both should be ruled out. I believe that that argument is important.

● (1220)

I now deal with Motions Nos. 15, 16 and 17. Motion No. 17 merely moves the definition to the front of the Bill. It is unamended and contains the exact wording as contained in the Bill previously. Motion No. 16 moves and amends the definition but it is an important definition. We have apparently agreed in principle that the definition of the purpose of the Bill is, as I have said, "An Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of grain".

This motion quite clearly falls four-square within that particular purpose as set out in the long title. This motion deals with shipper costs and there are a number of amendments before us that deal with shipper costs, some moved by the Government and others alternatively moved to try to provide a different way of dealing with what is supposed to be the principle of the Bill.

We are not suggesting that we should deal with other than what is contained in the Bill. We are not suggesting that the Government should spend more money than the Royal Recommendation permits. We are suggesting that the money should be spent differently. It would seem to us that if we are not exceeding the Royal Recommendation and if we are clearly within the scope of the Bill in terms of its long title, then an amendment to change the way in which the money is spent should at least be in order for debate. Again, whether or not it is acceptable in principle by the Government or by anyone else is a question to be decided by a vote of the House of Commons, but it is a question that can only be decided by a vote of the House of Commons.

Our argument on Motion No. 16 is clear. We have offered, within the scope of the Bill and within the Royal Recommendation, another way of accomplishing the purpose of the Bill as set out in its long title and also as set out in debate. We are offering another way to achieve the same objective, albeit perhaps with less onerous consequences.

We believe that the decision to be made in this case is a political decision and should be made in the House of Commons after proper debate. It is not one that should be made as a Preliminary ruling of the Chair to the effect that the motion is or is not within the scope of the Bill or that the motion does or does not infringe upon the Royal Recommendation. In our judgment, it clearly does neither of those two things.

In the interim ruling it has been suggested that Motion No. 18 is a substantive interpretation which again goes beyond the scope of the Bill. It is actually intended to limit the Government's prerogative to regulate system participants. Quite clearly, the Government has offered one way in which to solve what it believes is a problem. We have offered an alternative way. Our alternative way is again within the scope of the Bill in terms of the definition contained in the long title of the Bill. It is clearly within the scope of the Bill if one takes into account the Royal Recommendation.

Western Grain Transportation Act

Motion No. 18 narrows the scope of the Bill. It therefore reduces the cost but it does not introduce any new factors into the Bill. However, it does try to define more clearly who will be the recipients. In our judgment, it clarifies the intent of the Bill.

We initially considered Motion No. 18 to be a housekeeping amendment. We believed that it fell into that category and we were a little surprised to find that it was more than that. However, we do believe that it is again an amendment that must be decided politically. As long as it clearly deals with the same subject matter and not with other legislation and does none of the other things that I have referred to, it is a motion that should be considered as being within the scope of the Bill.

The suggestion has been that Motions Nos. 19 and 70 go beyond the scope of the Bill and are contrary to its purpose. We would make an argument that applies in every instance. To be beyond the scope of the Bill, we must deal with something other than that which is contained in the long title of the Bill. To be beyond the scope of the Bill, we must offer alternatives that are not envisaged as being practical and possible within the definition as set out in the long title of the Bill. We have not done that. We have said that among the many things that could be done with this legislation, our Motions Nos. 19 and 70 should be considered as things that could possibly be done.

Again, Motions Nos. 19 and 70 do not require that the Government spend more money than is allowed by the Royal Recommendation. In fact, if implemented, they would require that the Government spend less than allowed by the Royal Recommendation. Our argument is again quite clear, as it was on the previous motion. While I do not deny for a moment that it is an amendment of consequence, it is one that will have considerable force and effect on the people who will be required to change as a result of the Bill. It is still quite clearly within the scope of the Bill and is still quite clearly within the Royal Recommendation. I would argue that those are the two primary tests of whether or not an amendment is admissible for the purposes of debate and disposition by the House of Commons.

I turn now to Motions Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, 36 and 41. Motion No. 20 deals with the disposition of the Dominion coal lands. I am at a loss to understand why it goes beyond the scope of the Bill. The disposition of the Dominion coal lands is clearly mentioned in the Bill. The ultimate disposition of the Dominion coal lands is not spelled out, but again, I argue that our amendment simply indicates that if we are to dispose of the Dominion coal lands, we must dispose of them in such a way as would give the Province of British Columbia the jurisdiction. We do not suggest that anything else should happen.

Quite clearly, the question of the disposition of the Dominion coal lands is contained in the Bill, although I must confess that in this instance I suspect it should not be contained in the Bill. I do not think that that matter has any place in the Bill under any interpretation that any reasonable person would make when analysing the long title of the Bill. I frankly do not