

National Transportation Act, 1986

change the boundary stated in the Bill, it does not affect the designated area, its size, its shape, conditions, or anything else. The amendment only says that the commission "may". It does not require the commission. Also, the amendment relates to that part of the Bill which covers domestic air services, not the part of the Bill which covers the designated area. Perhaps I should have left out the words "designated area". In that case, the amendment would still mean the same thing.

I want to assure you, Sir, that I am not trying to accomplish something indirectly which I could not try to accomplish directly. I am only referring to markets with populations of 50,000 or less. Motion No. 48 in part reads:

—Where a domestic service is the only service for a market of less than 50,000 persons, and is outside of the designated area—

If it is inside the designated area it seems that the old regulated regime applies. However, I am thinking of the Cranbrooks of the world and many dozens of such places. Since there is a commitment by the Government that where there is imposed public duty because of a small market in order to ensure continuation of service, we want that to be part of the considerations for domestic services. That would apply in the whole country, and it does not do any damage to that part of the Bill concerning designated area. It is already there, anyway.

The amendment does not make a Cranbrook, for example, part of a designated area. However, it gives it a different consideration by the agency because of the size of its market and the service required. That is all. No other regulations apply to the designated area. It is just one criterion for small cities and large towns in scores of places which I submit need some kind of minimal standard that they can achieve. I submit that the amendment is in order and I hope you will reconsider it and so say, Sir.

● (1130)

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the House would let the Chair consult for just a moment.

I want to thank the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) for the comments which the House has just heard. I want to assure him that the Chair has been listening, but I am not persuaded that under the circumstances I ought properly, in conformity with good procedural law, to allow the arguments which the Hon. Member has put and put intelligently and forcefully. Therefore, I regret to advise the Hon. Member that while I understand very clearly the substance of his argument, I reluctantly must advise him that procedurally I do not think I can accept it. That being the case, I am prepared to make a ruling on the order of these amendments and the acceptability of them at this time.

I should advise Hon. Members that in view of the very great number, and in view of the fact that a great deal of work has gone into trying to be not only procedurally sound but as generous as possible, this ruling will take a few minutes. I would ask Hon. Members to bear with me.

I think copies have been made available to those Hon. Member who are most particularly concerned.

Mr. Thacker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have received what purports to be a draft of your ruling dated June 4, 1987 which is some 12 pages long. It may be that Members of the House would be prepared to have your formal reading of that ruling dispensed with as long as we all have copies of it.

Mr. Speaker: I want to thank the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary for his suggestion because it would save some time. However, I have some concern when rulings are made whether we should deem them to be made. Perhaps on another occasion I might be persuaded to accept the suggestion of the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary, assuming of course it was acceptable to the House.

I think perhaps under the circumstances I should read the ruling. There will be 111 motions standing on the *Notice Paper* at the report stage of Bill C-18, an Act respecting national transportation. When the House adjourned yesterday at 6 o'clock p.m., Motion No. 3 had been debated and a recorded division deferred, and debate had begun on Motion No. 4.

As there remain on the *Notice Paper* such a large number of motions not yet dealt with, many of which were debated at length during committee consideration, the Chair, after careful examination, has decided that a number of those which were debated and negatived in committee, along with some motions which are identical or consequential to them, together with a number of other motions, should not be selected. Therefore, the following motions will not be put to the House: Motions Nos. 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 18, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 36, 38, 39, 45, 55, 65, 66, 82, 92 and 96.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 5 was moved and withdrawn in committee, when the chairman expressed procedural reservations concerning the motion's possible infringement on the financial initiative of the Crown. I can understand that point of view but, in this instance, I am inclined to give the benefit of the doubt to the Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud). Therefore motion No. 5 will be debated and voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 6, 7 and 8 will not be selected. Motion No. 9 will be debated and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 10 and 11 will not be selected.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 12 will be debated and voted on separately.

Motion No. 13 will not be selected.

Motions Nos. 14 and 15 will be debated separately and voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 16, 17 and 50 would remove from the Governor in Council certain powers and grant them either to Parliament or to the Agency. Therefore they will be grouped