

*Western Grain Transportation Act*

argue whether or not they are substantive changes and go beyond the intent of the legislation or of the Royal Recommendation. Of course, this would only apply in the case where my motions made a change in the wording of the definitions. Even if we have made a change in the wording, if any can be found, then it must be pointed out where they are in violation of the Royal Recommendation and the intent of the legislation or where they go beyond the intent of the legislation. Should the Chair feel in a preliminary way that that is the case with those motions, naturally we would want to make proposals or argue as to any changes in wording.

● (1550)

I was somewhat taken aback with the amount of time spent on, and attention given to, Motion No. 2 by both the Chair and the House Leader for the Official Opposition. All it does is take some words out of Clause 34 and put them in Clause 2. For some reason that has not been explained to me, the Chair, its advisers and the House Leader for the Official Opposition are excited about that. I do not understand all the excitement and fuss.

The argument in committee was to do it one of two ways. The definitions would be all in one clause, so that people would know where to find them, or scattered throughout several clauses. There are good arguments for both sides. We took the view, and hence my amendments in committee and consequently the same amendments at report stage, that for convenience, good housekeeping and orderliness in a Bill all the definitions should be in one clause. It could be called the definitions clause. The definitions would all be in one place. When looking at subsequent clauses in the Bill, you would know where to find the definition because it would state "as defined in Clause 2". It would not matter whether you were dealing with Clause 34, Clause 54 or the Schedule. We tried bringing in a motion which would transfer the definition of grains from the Schedule to Clause 2. Schedule I defines grains. I thought definitions were to be in the Bill, not the Schedule.

The argument is whether or not definitions should be located in one clause. In subsequent clauses it would state "as defined in Clause 2". Without this, in Clause 34 there could be a definition affecting Clause 54. You would have to bounce back and forth in the Bill. Surely that is not good housekeeping. It is not an orderly manner in which to draft legislation.

When the committee was still hearing witnesses, and in particularly during the clause-by-clause study in the past few weeks of our deliberations, it became apparent that the Government had not done its homework, not only on Royal Recommendations but on its own amendments. It had not done its homework on the drafting of the Bill. It was determined to meet the June 30 deadline, then the September 12 deadline and then the Thanksgiving weekend deadline. I do not know what the next deadline will be.

I remind the Parliamentary Secretary of the definition of a deadline. In the North American vernacular, a deadline means a line is drawn and if you cross it, you are dead. I remind the

Parliamentary Secretary that if he insists on crossing that line he will be dead, politically that is.

Why all the fuss about these amendments? They merely ask the House to decide on the most orderly, convenient and practical way to house the definitions in the Bill. We submit that all the definitions should be in one clause and that all subsequent clauses have the reference "as defined in Clause 2". The definitions would be in alphabetical order in the marginal notes. Why all the fuss? Why is the Chair so concerned about moving a paragraph from one part of the Bill to another? I do not understand why the Chair is upset.

How can that be construed as substantive? Substantive means substantial. Substantial mean there have to be some kind of changes in the wording that would make it a substantive amendment. There is nothing in these motions which transfer definitions that is substantive.

The Chairman of the committee allowed the committee to deal with those motions. How they were dealt with in the committee is irrelevant. The point is they were in order in the committee and should be in order in this House. This is a housekeeping matter, how a Bill should be constructed and whether the subjects should be located in one part or another. It is not substantive.

Motions Nos. 2 to 19, 59, 64, 66, 67, 71, 129, 134, 139 and 145 which deal with definitions are listed by Madam Speaker when she gave her reasons for the unacceptability of certain motions. The motions she has listed do not make any change in the wording. They do nothing more than transfer the position of a definition from one place in the Bill to another. They are not substantive. This is nothing more than an attempt by the Government, counsel for the Department of Transport, and Members of the Opposition to arrive at a conclusion as to where definitions should be located in the legislation. That is all there is to it. If any of the motions enumerated by Madam Speaker in giving her reasons for unacceptability contain changes of wording as well as transfer a definition from one part of the Bill to Clause 2, we will want to discuss with the Chair whether those motions are substantive, go beyond the intent of the legislation, or exceed the Royal Recommendation.

We may be wrong in some of those, but I do not know whether the Chair has sorted out which of these motions makes no changes in wording and which makes a change in wording. I would be grateful to have from the Chair a list of the motions transferring definitions from Clauses 34 and 54 to Clause 2. Also, I would be grateful to have from the Chair a list of those motions which change the wording of the definition, and then I would like to have reasons from the Chair for their unacceptability, and I would want to discuss this at an appropriate time two or three days hence.

● (1600)

In the meantime, Sir, as far as Motions Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 are concerned, they use the same wording as used in Clauses 34 or 54, and we have only moved to have those words transferred from those clauses to Clause 2 in order to consolidate all the definitions into Clause 2. I am anxious to hear