

relating to transportation, namely, the National Transportation Act, which really should be considered as the umbrella piece of legislation under which this Bill will function, and the ports Bill. In my motion I attempted to define a similar statement of purpose. In part my motion reads:

It is hereby declared that an economic, efficient and reliable grain transportation system making the best use of all available modes of transportation at the lowest total cost is essential to protect the interests of the grain producers and to maintain the economic well-being and growth of western Canada, and that these objectives are most likely to be achieved under conditions ensuring that

(a) grain producers retain the benefit of a statutory freight rate and are protected from freight rate increases disproportionate to international grain prices;

(b) the railway companies and the Government of Canada accept a continuing obligation to provide producers with a special transportation rate for the movement of grain;

(c) the Government of Canada makes an annual financial contribution to the grain transportation system to ensure fair compensation for the movement of grain;—

It was patterned after the thrust of Section 3 of the National Transportation Act which outlined the stated objective and purpose of that Bill. Unless we pull it all together, unless there is some clause that clearly defines the total objective of the legislation, we could bootleg clauses such as the one under Section 62 which, for all intents and purposes and for all times, transfers the Dominion coal lands to the federal Government and lifts the \$2 per tonne freeze.

In terms of the necessity of its being included in the Bill, it is not required from a legal or technical point of view. Unless there is a broad statement of purpose, we could throw in everything but the kitchen sink. I submit that is wrong, but if we get away with it, Mr. Speaker, you will have to broaden the latitude under which you assess the procedural acceptability of the amendments being advanced.

The National Transportation Act is the umbrella piece of legislation under which most transportation laws and Acts are governed. In part, Section 3 reads:

It is hereby declared that an economic, efficient and adequate transportation system making the best use of all available modes of transportation at the lowest total cost is essential to protect the interests of the users of transportation and to maintain the economic well-being and growth of Canada, and that these objectives are most likely to be achieved when all modes of transport are able to compete under conditions ensuring that having due regard to national policy and to legal and constitutional requirements

(a) regulation of all modes of transport will not be of such a nature as to restrict the ability of any mode of transport to compete freely with any other modes of transport;

(b) each mode of transport, so far as practicable, bears a fair proportion of the real costs of the resources, facilities and services provided that mode of transport at public expense;—

Then it outlines the essential components of achieving that objective. If we look at the ports Bill which was recently considered by the House in this session, it is consistent with the aims and objectives of the National Transportation Act and the aims and objectives set out in the clause of this Bill. Again under Section 3 there is a statement of purpose and intent which reads:

It is hereby declared that the objective of the national ports policy for Canada is to create a port system that

Western Grain Transportation Act

(a) is an effective instrument of support for the achievement of Canadian international trade objectives and of national, regional and local economic and social objectives;

(b) is efficient;

(c) provides accessibility and equitable treatment in the movement of goods and persons to users of Canadian ports;

(d) provides local port corporations with a high degree of autonomy—

The basic thrust of the new ports policy was to give local ports a greater amount of autonomy to run their own shop, so to speak. It is not only enshrined in the clause but it is enshrined in a statement of purpose and intent. It is very easy for a Speaker or anyone to rule whether in fact we are stepping beyond the bounds of the parameters contained therein.

My statement of purpose enshrined in Motion No. 1 clearly serves to fit that bill, clearly tries to help consolidate all the main objectives the piece of legislation attempts to achieve. I humbly submit that it is totally consistent with the thrust of the Bill and that it should be considered in terms of rounding out a piece of legislation which will be so all-encompassing. Unless you are prepared to accept such a statement of purpose as being procedurally acceptable, I submit the confusion in terms of whether or not an amendment is in order or consistent with the intent will continue to exist.

If you persist in suggesting in your preliminary ruling, Mr. Speaker, that Motion No. 1, which is a statement of purpose, is out of order, it will be important for you to give widest possible consideration to the motions included for debate because of the broadness of this piece of legislation. The sky is almost the limit when it comes to dealing with amendments and debate having regard to the facilitating, shipping and handling of western grain.

● (1430)

Failing the acceptability of Motion No. 1, I humbly suggest and plead with you, Sir, that you give the widest possible latitude in considering the amendments presented herewith, unless the bulk of the amendments go beyond the Royal Recommendation; that is clearly a very different matter. But in terms of going beyond the intent, my humble submission is that the sky is practically the limit when you have a Bill with the title "An Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof". That is a very all-encompassing title. As I have reviewed the motions, they are very specifically and directly attached to that broad objective. Moreover, they are pertinent to the clauses of the Bill. I hope you will consider that when you make your final ruling.

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, I want to comment very briefly on this. From a personal point of view, it makes little difference to me whether there is a preamble to the Bill. I can understand the desire on the part of some Members to have a preamble. In cases of complex legislation, it might be good to have it accompanied by a preamble. It would make more definite the purpose and intent of the Bill, and would make committee work more precise.