

Mr. Mazankowski:—it appears the NDP simply wants to filibuster on frivolous motions and fight the Bill, not on the basis of whether it is going to be in the best interests of the agricultural community or the producers of Canada but on whether in fact it is going to be in the NDP's best ideological and philosophical interests.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is in the hands of the House. At this point there does not appear to be unanimous consent with regard to the suggestion of the Hon. Member for the Yukon. In the circumstances, the Chair suggests that we proceed with debate on Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49.

The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) is rising.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am happy to know that the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) called Motion No. 48 frivolous. I am happy to know that he is calling all his own motions frivolous.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not making a point of order. The Hon. Member will be recognized in due course and will have an opportunity to present his comments on what is taking place in the House.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member knows that a point of order has to be a point of order.

Mr. Blenkarn: He hasn't got a point of order.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, with all respect, my point of order is exactly the same as the one raised by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. He proceeded to complete all his remarks on a spurious point of order. I would like equal time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Benjamin: The hon. gentleman for Vegreville is calling a motion—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Is the Hon. Member suggesting that he himself has a spurious point of order? Is he saying himself that he is seeking the floor on a spurious point of order on the grounds that somebody else has a spurious point of order and succeeded? If that is the Hon. Member's argument, surely it is *reductio ad absurdum*. Surely he cannot expect the Chair to take that kind of argument on face value. The Chair suggests to the Hon. Member that the best course would be to proceed to a debate and, we hope, complete the debate on Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49, at which point the Hon. Member or some other Member of his Party can well reply to what he considers to be the allegations of the Hon. Member for Vegreville. But I suggest it is a matter of debate.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Western Grain Transportation Act

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I assume we are back to Bill C-155 and Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49. To bring the House back to where we are in the debate, we have three motions facing us which make some amendments to Clauses 22 and 25. These are the clauses that deal with the way the House is proposing to handle recommendations from the Grain Transportation Agency Administrator. The Bill provides an opportunity for the House to discuss the proposed regulations of that agency and sets out the timetable and the time limits for such debate.

● (1610)

We are operating now under a form of closure under Standing Order 82 which allows for two days on report stage and a further day for third reading debate. The proposed change to the Act would provide for a one-hour debate under these circumstances. The regulations of the Grain Transportation Agency Administrator would go to the Minister who would file them before Parliament 15 sitting days after they had been presented to him. After having been filed and within five sitting days, either 15 Senators in the other place or 30 Members in this Chamber could cause them to be debated. The process of the debate would be that the regulations would be transferred to the appropriate committee where they would be dealt with fairly expeditiously and would be returned to the House or the Senate, depending upon where the initiation had occurred, and be debated for one hour.

The motions question whether the number of Senators and Members of the House should be the same or otherwise. In Motion No. 47 we are saying that it should take the same number of Senators as Members of the House of Commons to initiate such a debate and have it sent to committee. Also the Bill proposes that once the regulations have been put before the House or the Senate, they will automatically become law six months after being presented to the committee, whether or not they are returned from the committee, I presume, or 20 days after they were laid before Parliament by the Minister, if the House or the Senate chooses not to debate the regulations.

It is our contention that one hour is not an adequate amount of time, given the possibilities which could arise from these regulations. According to the wording of the Bill, the Administrator is responsible for laying out the awards and sanctions for all grain transportation participants; not only the railroads—and it may be changed as a result of some of the later votes—but also elevator companies, farmers, truckers, terminal operators, labour unions and perhaps even shippers on the seaway. Not only does he have the job of imposing awards and sanctions on the participants in the industry, he will be laying out by regulation the performance indicators, whatever they are. I presume they will be the basis for judging whether various participants have been doing a good job, whether it is adequate or inadequate, or whether a fine should be levied because it was judged to be inadequate. In short, we see some of the first regulations coming out of this process as being almost as complex and all-encompassing as the Bill. There could be a whole host of regulations going on for 30 pages or 40 pages. We do not think that that can be adequately dealt