

Western Grain Transportation Act

our part to alter any of those amendments but simply for ease of handling to move those clauses to another part of the Bill.

Let me give an example. I will not read it into the record, but Motion No. 2, the base scale amendment, is identical to a portion of Clause 34(1) of the Bill. We are simply suggesting that it be moved. Motion No. 3 deals with CN adjustments. The content of what we have said capsulizes what was contained in Clause 56(1) of the Bill. It does not alter it in any substantive way. It does not require any additional expenditure by the Crown. It is simply another way of defining the same circumstances. I suggest there is nothing out of order in that. Motion No. 4, the cost change per tonne, is in essence exactly identical to Clause 54(1). We are asking only that it be moved from where it now is to another part of the Bill. Under Motion No. 5, Crow benefit, we have in essence taken exactly what appears in the definition of Crow benefit and moved it to another part of the Bill, consistent with our view that those definitions should all appear in one place.

Motion No. 12, final adjustments, similarly, with minor word changes, does not alter the purpose, nor does it impose upon the Crown any additional expenditure, but simply moves the clause with some word alterations. The word alterations do not in any way negate the principle of the definition that exists in the Bill. Neither does it require the Government to spend more. In fact, it may well require the Government to spend less.

Under Motion No. 15, interim adjustment, the same is true, and minor word changes exist only because our motion did not include report stage amendments. Under Motion No. 17, the rate of cost change, the same situation prevails. The substantive part of what we have done is move that definition from one place in the Bill to another place in the Bill.

I suggest in tentatively ruling that they are unacceptable—they may well be unacceptable to the Government and the House of Commons in a substantive sense, but in terms of their procedural acceptability—they do nothing to alter the purpose of the Bill as set out in the long title. They do nothing to alter the method to be used in determining what the interpretation is intended to serve. I would ask that those amendments in particular be allowed to stand for that reason.

In addition, I ask that it be ruled that it is appropriate. As I suggested, according to Erskine May it is appropriate for Members to move a motion, which we would be doing, a clause of this Bill, in this case that section of a clause, to another part of the Bill. I do not see that there can be anything out of order in that.

I now want to turn to Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 67. They are motions that in one way are grouped for purposes of the interim ruling of the Speaker. They have been ruled by the Chair in the interim ruling to be substantive changes in many instances to interpretative clauses. I will deal with them one at a time because it is necessary to do so. We have made no substantive changes.

Motion No. 12, for example, moves the definition to the front, as do the other motions. Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11

have changes contained within them, but the changes would, in effect, reduce the cost to the Crown. Surely it is within the prerogative of the House of Commons to propose amendments which would reduce the cost to the Crown. That is a well held prerogative of the House.

My colleague the Opposition House Leader indicated yesterday all of the precedents for that. I am sure I do not have to go into them. I am quite confident that the Chair is as aware as every other Member that a Member of Parliament can rise at any time on any financial Bill and move that the amount be decreased. They certainly may not rise as per the Standing Orders of the House of Commons—

Mr. Nielsen: You cannot do it on second reading.

Mr. Deans: My colleague says you cannot do it at second reading, but you certainly do it when those clauses are rightfully before the House of Commons, and the clauses would be before the House of Commons were they to be ruled admissible at this point in time. We are not arguing that we should have the right to increase the Crown's financial prerogative. We are not arguing that what we have proposed here will require upon the Crown an additional tax or levy of taxation. It will not require the Crown to spend more public moneys than are outlined within the Royal Recommendation. In many instances, if they were to be carried by the House after substantive discussion, they would in fact reduce the cost to the Crown. I claim that is quite clearly within the prerogative of the Opposition, or for that matter within the prerogative of the Government or any Government Member. I am not going to read the authorities in.

The example I would use so that the Speaker can check it is Motion No. 9. It applies to all of them, I believe. Motion No. 9 limits the liability to the Government for grants to the railroads. It modifies the existing wording, but it is not contrary to the long title. It is not even contrary to the content of the Bill, regardless of how you define the Bill. It says that there can be grants, but it is not necessary that the grants be made. We believe that should be deemed to be admissible. Whether it is acceptable subsequently in the debate to the House as a whole is a question that can be dealt with later, but it certainly should be admissible.

It has been indicated that Motion No. 12 is deemed to be contrary to the intent of the Bill, yet in this instance again all we are doing is relocating existing wording within the Bill. I will not make the argument; it has already been made. We see no reason why we cannot do that.

Motion No. 13 has to be considered in consequence with Motion No. 14. I have argued that Motion No. 14 is perhaps not acceptable. I am not going to make that argument, but if it were to be decided by the Chair that my argument is not one that can be sustained, then I suggest that Motion No. 13 carries the same obligation; and if Motion No. 14 is therefore acceptable, then Motion No. 13 should at least be offered for debate. That alternative plan, if you will, does not go beyond the Royal Recommendation for Motion No. 14 nor does it go beyond the definition or the long title of the Bill. If one is to be