

● (1610)

Motions Nos. 87, 139, 146, 147, 150, 153, 155 and 165 are contrary to the principle of the Bill as agreed to at second reading. The purpose of the Bill, as I understand it, is to provide for new rates for the movement of grain through the Crowsnest Pass. Motion No. 87, for example, would keep the rates as they existed on June 16, 1983. This, in my view, is clearly contrary to the principle of the Bill. In other words, the amendments propose to negate the principle of the Bill as agreed to at second reading. That is really the difficulty with which the Chair is confronted.

Motions Nos. 104 to 114 inclusive, 172 and 173 infringe on the financial initiative of the Crown. For example, Motion No. 105, by allowing a shipment in excess of 31.1 million tonnes to qualify for the Crow benefit and Motion No. 172 by adding new crops to Schedule I would involve expenditures not covered by the Royal Recommendation. It would extend the objects and purposes or relax the conditions and qualifications as expressed in the Royal Recommendation.

Motions Nos. 51, 73, 86 and 151 give the Chair difficulties for two reasons. They are contrary to the principle of the Bill and infringe upon the Crown's financial initiative.

Motions Nos. 74, 152 and 157 are new propositions which are clearly outside the scope of the Bill. Motion No. 157 proposes to place in the Bill a new Part IV concerning "Shipper Share Limitations". This is a new concept not envisaged in the Bill. As Motion No. 74 is consequential to Motion No. 157, whatever decision is made on Motion No. 157 will also apply to Motion No. 74. Motion No. 152 proposes to extend the Crow benefit to the grain producers of the Peace River district, which likewise was not covered by the Bill as read a second time.

Motions Nos. 75 and 116 to 126 inclusive were dealt with in my statement on Monday last. They are clearly irrelevant to the Bill as amended by the committee and reported to the House. Any Member who compares these motions with the Bill as reprinted will quickly see what I mean. I would urge the Hon. Member who presented these motions to look at that. I am sure that he will readily agree with me.

As stated in Section 4 of Citation 773, *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition*:

An amendment is inadmissible if it refers to, or is not intelligible without, subsequent amendments or schedules, or if it is otherwise incomplete.

This rule must by extension be followed at the report stage.

Motion No. 174 proposing to amend the title will be ruled on by the Chair when the motion is reached, as I have indicated earlier this week.

I would therefore propose, in the interest of clarity and for the early conduct of the debate, to call upon the Hon. Member for Vegreville to present argument in support of Motion No. 1 standing in his name, and thereafter proceed to hear argument on the other motions grouped in the categories which I have suggested.

Western Grain Transportation Act

I would like to warn all Hon. Members that this of course is not a debate on substance; it is merely a debate on procedure. I will only allow arguments that deal with procedure and will not allow Members to go into the substance of this Bill because that debate will take place in the House later. These procedural arguments are naturally of interest to the debate in the House and that is why I am allowing them. I will ask all Hon. Members to keep very much in mind that they are presenting procedural arguments to the Chair and nothing else. I am warning then that I will be very strict as to relevance in all of their interventions.

I would also like Hon. Members to be brief because we have in mind that the debate on this particular Bill shall be unrepentive, and that is one of the reasons I have suggested that we group the motions so that all motions which refer to certain procedural difficulties should be discussed together. The same arguments would apply to all of these motions. Therefore, I would ask Hon. Members to be brief and unrepentive, because these arguments are allowed in compliance with the Speaker's discretion as outlined in Standing Order 75(10) which reads as follows:

The Speaker shall have power to select or combine amendments or clauses to be proposed at the report stage and may, if he or she thinks fit, call upon any Member who has given notice of an amendment to give such explanation of the subject of the amendment as may enable the Speaker to form a judgment upon it.

The rules are very clear. There is the discretion of the Speaker to call upon Members to give explanations concerning their amendments. I would ask Hon. Members to take into account as well the beginning of that Standing Order which reads:

The Speaker shall have the power to select or combine amendments or clauses—

Of course, that means that the Speaker has the power to rule on the acceptability of amendments. Should the debate become repetitive or if it does not focus on procedural arguments and goes instead into substance, then there are other powers which the Speaker may use. I think all Hon. Members should be well aware of that.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I regret having to interrupt my colleagues, the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) and the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), but before we find ourselves in any further difficulties, I would like to call something to the attention of the Chair. I would like to make it clear right now, Madam Speaker, that in no way am I calling into question a previous ruling of the Chair.

We are presently dealing with Motion No. 33. The next two motions to come up are Motions Nos. 34 and 35 which are consequential. If Motion No. 34 stands and is adopted, Motion No. 35 drops. If Motion No. 34 is not adopted, then we move to Motion No. 35.

I draw to your attention, Madam Speaker, that I drew to the attention of the House on Thursday, September 29, that I was pleased to hear your preliminary ruling dealing with Motions Nos. 24, 25, 26, 27 and 29, that Motion No. 24 would