

*Western Grain Transportation Act*

In the interest of my colleague who has been very detrimentally affected by the lighting, which happens to strike more severely on the back rows than it does on the front rows, I would ask that she be permitted on this one occasion, without establishing a precedent, to complete her remarks, which could not take more than five minutes, with the protection of the hat.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair will ask for the last time, is there unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There does not appear to be unanimous consent. The Chair in the circumstances—

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would simply like the record to show that there was unanimous consent from the Progressive Conservative Party. Unanimous consent was denied by the Liberal Party Members.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am sure Hon. Members will understand the reasons for which the Chair is ruling, reluctantly, at this point that there is not unanimous consent. I am sure it is quite clear to all Hon. Members that there is not.

Would the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) please take his seat while I am standing. The Chair invites Hon. Members at this point to recognize the obvious fact that there is not unanimous consent. The Chair will therefore ask the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—

**Mr. Skelly:** Mr. Speaker, your tolerance is appreciated. The question really spoils over into a very interesting debate on a question of privilege. It would be my assessment that my privileges as a Member of this House are being impaired by those lights.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Skelly:** I wish to suggest, Mr. Speaker, if you would allow me to continue for a moment—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member cannot challenge the fact that there is not unanimous consent. The Standing Order is clear. The Chair will not hear any further—

**Mr. Skelly:** On a question of privilege—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** No. Please. Will the Hon. Member please resume his seat. The Chair has heard considerable argument from representatives from all sides of the House and does not propose to hear any more argument on the Standing Order which is abundantly clear. There is not unanimous consent to dispense with it and therefore the Hon. Member cannot add to what has been said.

**Mr. Skelly:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I wish to know whether the Speaker is denying me the opportunity to raise a question of privilege which I understand to be in order at any time in which it is raised. Second, we are not

debating or discussing the matter of the hat at this time and the reference under the Standing Orders. We are discussing—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The Chair does not quite understand how the Hon. Member can talk about privilege when we have had a very specific appeal under Standing Order 32. That is the issue. The Chair is ruling with regard to Standing Order 32, a very old Standing Order of this House, the origin of which is beyond any doubt and the application of which is clear. The Chair is ruling with regard to Standing Order 32 with genuine reluctance. The Chair would like to say to the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood that if anyone sympathizes with the problem she has raised, it is the Chair. In the circumstances, the Chair must ask the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood to remove her hat to complete her speech.

**Ms. McDonald:** Mr. Speaker, before resuming my speech, I would just like to point out that the remarks of the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) denying me the privilege of—

**An Hon. Member:** Don't reflect on a ruling of the Chair.

**Ms. McDonald:** I would like to point out that these were sexist remarks. My appeal to the House was on the basis of my eyes. I did not appeal on the basis of my sex. He assumes that when a woman rises, she is dealing with a matter of sex. This is a preposterous assumption. I happen to have extremely sensitive eyes. I resent his remarks. I resent his interpretation of it.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi, and the Chair again pleads with Hon. Members not to raise spurious points of order.

**Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi):** Mr. Speaker, I am not raising a spurious point of order. My point of order is that the Hon. Member has attributed to me motives that she does not know I have and which I do not have. When I can come into the House without a jacket and a tie, as she can, I will agree to what she wants to do.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There is no point of order.

**Ms. McDonald:** Mr. Speaker, to resume my discussion of the subsidies to the CPR, among the enormous subsidies made to CPR were land rights, including mineral rights and timber rights. All together, \$106 million in cash was received and about 44 million acres of land, including surface and mineral rights. It is impossible to say what the total gift was because the full value of all the subsidies has not been realized. According to John Gallagher in "To Kill the Crow", a rather useful book on the subject, and I quote:

The land grant gave the CPR a mammoth fortune, of staggering dimensions, from which the company has drawn and continues to draw enormous profits.

The CPR profited immediately by selling some of the land, but more so by encouraging people to get free government lands and to hold theirs for the future sales. The City of