

aspect that concerns the Chair. As Motion No. 74 is consequential to Motion No. 157, a decision with respect to Motion No. 157 would also apply to Motion No. 74. Thus I find Motions Nos. 157 and 74 out of order.

Motion No. 152 proposes to extend the Crow benefit to the grain producers of the Peace River district, which, likewise, is not covered by the Bill as read a second time. Thus I also find it out of order.

Motions Nos. 75 and 116 to 126 inclusive are clearly irrelevant to the Bill as amended by the committee and reported to the House and thus they are out of order for the reasons I gave on October 6. Members are referred to Citation 773(4) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. Motion No. 174 proposing to amend the title, as I said on October 6, will be ruled on by the Chair when the motion is reached.

The Hon. Member for Yukon has suggested a grouping of certain motions in relation to the rate structure proposed in the Bill. I am prepared to accept this suggestion. However, in order to accommodate this proposal, certain other motions will have to be grouped with them for the purpose of debate.

Therefore, Motions Nos. 63, 68, 69, 99 to 103 inclusive, 115, 127, 128, 130 to 133 inclusive, 136 to 138 inclusive, 140 to 144 inclusive, and 148 and 149, are grouped for debate with the voting steps as follows: Motions Nos. 63, 68, 69, 103, 115, 130, 133, 138 and 142 are to be voted on separately. A vote on Motion No. 99 will dispose of Motion No. 100. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 101 will dispose of Motion No. 102; a negative vote on Motion No. 101 will require a vote on Motion No. 102.

A vote on Motion No. 127 will dispose of Motion No. 128; a vote on Motion No. 131 will dispose of Motion No. 132; a vote on Motion No. 136 will dispose of Motion No. 137; a vote on Motion No. 140 will dispose of Motion No. 141; a vote on Motion No. 143 will dispose of Motion No. 144, and a vote on Motion No. 148 will dispose of Motion No. 149.

In summary, and for the convenience of Hon. Members, I will enumerate all those motions ruled out of order. They are Motions Nos. 1 to 23 inclusive, 28, 51, 54, 57, 59, 64, 66, 67, 70, 73, 74, 75, 80, 81, 85, 86, 87, 89, 104 to 114 inclusive, 116 to 126 inclusive, 129, 134, 135, 139, 146, 147, 150 to 152 inclusive, 155, 157, 165, 166, 172 and 173.

An Hon. Member: What's left?

Madam Speaker: You can debate the rest.

There are other points that I must address which arise from the able arguments put forward by Hon. Members during the procedural debate. The Hon. Member for Yukon has questioned whether or not the Royal Recommendation which the Government has attached to its amendments has been provided in the required form. This is an interesting point. It is also novel in that such arguments have not been raised since 1969 when the present report stage was first introduced and adopted by the House.

The Hon. Member had no objection to the original Royal Recommendation accompanying Bill C-155 and, to this end,

Western Grain Transportation Act

quoted Citation 541 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. However, the Hon. Member feels that Citation 548 of Beauchesne's is in conflict with Standing Order 79(6), which states:

(6) When a recommendation of the Governor General is required in relation to any amendment to be proposed at the report stage of a bill, at least twenty-four hours written notice shall be given of the said recommendation and proposed amendment.

I can understand the Hon. Member's point of view but I do not agree with it. He bases his argument on the words "once for all (unless withdrawn and replaced)" which can be found in Citation 540 of Beauchesne's. However, it is clear to me that the present practice of covering a report stage motion with a specific Royal Recommendation as required by Standing Order 79(6) goes back to 1969. It is the final sentence of Citation 540 which convinces the Chair That the Hon. Member does not have a case on this point, and I quote that citation:

And this standard is binding not only on private Members but also on Minister whose only advantage is that, as advisors of the Crown, they can present new or supplementary estimates or secure the Royal Recommendation to new or supplementary resolutions.

• (1540)

I am in agreement with the views expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) that the interpretation to be given to this sentence is that Ministers may obtain new or supplementary Royal Recommendations which are attached to report stage motions and printed on the notice paper.

I thank the Hon. Member for Yukon for having brought this point to the attention of the House, but I can only suggest that the apparent anomalies or inconsistencies ought to be considered by the Procedure Committee.

The other matter I wish to address was brought to the attention of the House by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain when he expressed his concern that the Bill was not properly before the House. The Hon. Member argued that the long title does not cover the content of the Bill. With respect, I must disagree with this view. As I stated in a ruling I made on June 20 of this year, when the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain raised a similar point during the second reading debate, the Bill is properly before the House.

The Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) has the floor.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, before lunch I was pointing out some of the powers given to the Administrator in this Bill and was commenting on Motion No. 35 which would amend one of the provisions of the Bill that was added in committee. It seemed to me that the powers of the Administrator had been quite generally stated in the original Bill and that the addition of Clause 4 simply spelled out a power concerning agreements for the trucking of grain which had already been available to the Administrator, but did not deal with the question of where the money would come from.