

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 31, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

● (1105)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

#### MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Monday, October 24, 1983 consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motions Nos. 47 and 49 (Mr. Benjamin), and Motion No. 48 (Mr. Mazankowski).

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, when debate finished on Monday a week ago at one o'clock, I was making the point that Motions Nos. 48 and 49 were important because they allow for considerably more time for debate on regulations which the Administrator would recommend than do the Government's proposals. The Government has suggested that one hour is sufficient time for Parliament to take a good look at those regulations.

Officials of the Ministry of Transport admitted that the ability of the Administrator to make regulations which could be brought before the House and passed was very important. In fact, it was admitted that it was so important that they thought it could not be done entirely by Cabinet but that it should have some relationship to Parliament. Because it was so important for this to be referred to Parliament, they implied that it would be wrong to apply awards and sanctions by way of Order in Council and that it therefore should be brought to Parliament. I do not have his exact words before me, Mr. Speaker, but an official of the department indicated that the applications of awards and sanctions were so important that they should not be left to Cabinet but that Parliament should be allowed plenty of time to look into the matter.

To Members on the Government side, "plenty of time" appears to be one hour because that is what was put into the Bill. The Government has allowed a one-hour debate on the matter. Conservative Members went one step further. Through Motion No. 48, they suggested that the opportunity for debate should be extended to three sitting days. We can accept that and would support that, Mr. Speaker. However, Members of the New Democratic Party have gone even further through

Motion No. 49 which stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). That motion would extend the debate on that issue to an unlimited time until the House had decided that the debate was adequate.

Perhaps this is a pretty good indication of the value the three Parties put on the parliamentary process. Liberal Members would allow for one hour, Conservative Members would allow for three days and New Democratic Party Members would allow for full, responsible Government as indicated by unlimited debate.

The esteem Liberal Members have for Parliament is pretty well indicated by that particular clause in this Bill. Their arrogance and disdain for Parliament has been further strengthened by the very fact that they have now taken this Bill out of public debate by closure and will give Parliament two more days in which to find out what the country wants. It is not that they do not know how the majority of people in the country feel about this Bill. It had ample opportunity to find out and discovered that it did not have a consensus in the West which it promised it would get before it moved on this particular Bill. This has always been a bureaucrat's Bill and now that closure has been imposed we see that all the hearings and the shows the Government has put on in the West have had no real impact on the content of the Bill.

● (1110)

The essence of good government is consent. There has been no consensus with this Bill and there clearly has been no consent on the part of the Government because the people who are most affected by it do not want this Bill to be passed. Therefore the implication of that is that there is no way this Bill can reflect good government.

One only needs to ask the former Minister to see the indication of just exactly what western Canadian farmers feel about this Bill. For every letter he received in support of the Bill he received 561 letters opposing it. In fact, he received 38,713 letters opposing the passage of this Bill and only 69 letters in support of its passage.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair hesitates to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to make some comments with respect to the