

*Western Grain Transportation Act*

Standing Order 73 which indicates that no Bill may be introduced either in blank or in imperfect shape. Of course our contention is that this Bill is presently in an imperfect shape. I would humbly suggest to the Hon. Speaker that when he discusses this or gives his ruling—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Again the Hon. Member is raising a totally different point of order. This was not the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, which we are supposed to be discussing at this point. At this stage, after no many hours of debate before the House, it is very difficult for the Chair somehow to accept an argument that the Bill is in blank or imperfectly drafted shape. I invite Hon. Members to deal with the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain. I recognize the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, who has already had ample time.

● (1140)

**Mr. Deans:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask you a question in order to clarify the matter. Am I to understand from the comments that you have just completed that the question relating to the amount of time the Bill has been before the House is relevant to a decision which might be made as to whether or not—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member has raised a point of order. The Chair is trying to contain the debate to the point of order raised by the Hon. Member. If he is trying to deal with another point of order at this stage—

**Mr. Deans:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Dauphin-Swan River (Mr. Lewycky) was raising a different line of attack on the Bill, an entirely different point of order. He was stating that the Bill was in imperfect form according to Section 72 of the Standing Orders, which is not the point raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain. Therefore, in the interest of trying to be relevant and in trying to deal with the business before the House, the Chair is asking if there are any further interventions on the point of the order before us.

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, if you would be kind enough just to hear me out for less than a minute, perhaps I can explain. The question of the amount of time that the Bill has been before the House was raised in the interjection by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Smith). I am concerned that that particular reference may well influence the decision of the Chair. I am asking simply that if that particular reference is to influence the decision of the Chair, the Chair take into account, one, that we raised with the Government on May 19—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member has set forth his record of what he has done. He has to have some confidence that the Chair will not be guided by extraneous considerations. The Chair does not intend to give the Hon. Member an opportunity to deal with every extraneous consideration introduced in this debate, because there have been many of

them. The Chair will deal with the point of order raised by the Hon. Member in the context in which the Hon. Member set his point. The Chair will do its very best to do justice to the point that he has raised. It invites other Hon. Members, if they are intervening, to deal with the point of order and not deliberately waste the time of the House.

**Mr. Hovdebo:** Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the point of order, I intend to deal with the two parts of the Bill and try to show you, Mr. Speaker, that the two areas are quite separate and that, in dealing with the two parts together, the Members of this House, as well as the country, are being forced to look at the Bill incorrectly. The Bill deals with a change in the statutory rates for grain. It does not deal with potash—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member is making the same point made by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain made the point. He called it a complicated question dealing with other matters. That is the point that the Chair must decide. Is the Hon. Member adding to the argument? If so, in what way is he adding something fresh?

**Mr. Hovdebo:** Mr. Speaker, the Bill does not deal with potash, freight rates, or coal freight rates. It does deal with grain freight rates. Grain accounts for 14 per cent of the movement through the mountains, and it is a much smaller percentage of the freight moved across Canada. Therefore there is no reason why grain freight rates should be connected to the upgrading of the railways when all of the other freight rates are not connected to it.

We recognize that the grain freight rates are statutory and therefore have to be dealt with by this House. They should continue to be statutory and to be dealt with by this House. To attach them to the upgrading to the railways is unnecessary. It has no relationship. If you do that, you should bring in every other freight rate as well.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, I will try to stay relevant and not waste the time of the House in reviewing the arguments advanced by the Opposition as to why the Bill should be split. I would bring to the attention of the Chair, however, that I have reviewed carefully the statements made by the Parliamentary Secretary last Thursday. I did listen carefully to him in the House. I suggest that in our parliamentary tradition there must be some onus on the Government to advance argument as to why the Bill should not be split. There has not been one single argument advanced by a Government spokesperson as to why these principles should be contained in a single measure.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Can the Hon. Member cite an instance where the Chair has directed the splitting of a Bill? It would be helpful.

**Mr. Hawkes:** If we go back to 1888, on that occasion the Speaker acted on the advice and on the complaint of a single Member of the House who felt Members had difficulty in voting on two principles in one vote.