

Western Grain Transportation Act

(a) libraries (not including school libraries)	51
(b) prisons	1
(c) senior citizens' clubs	9
(d) cultural centres (broadly defined and not appearing elsewhere on this list)	16
(e) hospitals	4
(f) native people's organizations	8
(g) primary schools	4
(h) high schools	73

2. The Council purchased 208 copies.

3. The total cost was \$1,489.28.

4. Distribution costs are not separately accounted for individual titles. Distribution of kits of 200 titles cost a total of \$21,920, so the average per title was \$109.60 or, in the case of "Flaunting It", approximately 60 cents per copy.

[Translation]

Mr. Maltais: I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Madam Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone)—Grain—Western Grain Stabilization Program. (b) Five-year averaging principle; the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight)—Grain—Increase in premiums—Request for change in payout formula.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motion No. 33 (Mr. Mazankowski).

Madam Speaker: Before embarking on the procedural arguments that Hon. Members will undoubtedly wish to make to enlighten the Chair, I would like to categorize for the benefit of Hon. Members the motions and the reasons behind my reservations concerning their acceptability. I think that will contribute to focusing the debate and having it take place with a certain order. I suggest to Hon. Member that it would facilitate the procedural debate if they were to relate their remarks to a group of motions, and I will group them, except of course where a motion stands by itself.

Motion No. 1 attempts to introduce into the Bill a disguised preamble. This is a very interesting point. It is not often that an Hon. Member attempts to amend a Bill in such a way as to include a clause setting out the objectives of Parliament in relation to the transportation of grain. Although the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) does not include the normal "whereas" paragraphs, it is an attempt to place in the Bill a preamble. In other words, what the Hon. Member cannot do directly he is attempting to do indirectly. In this regard I refer Hon. Members to a statement I made on July 13, 1981, at page 11463 of *Hansard*, in which I had referred to a previous ruling made by Mr. Speaker Lamoureux on June 11, 1973, in relation to the inclusion of a preamble in a Bill.

Motions Nos. 2 to 19 inclusive, 59, 64, 66, 67, 70, 129, 134, 135 and 145 are substantive amendments to interpretation clauses namely, Clauses 2, 34 and 54 of the Bill. These motions attempt to modify existing definitions in various interpretation clauses throughout the Bill or tend to add completely new definitions or transfer definitions from Parts II and III of the Bill to Clause 2 which offers definitions for the entire Bill. In order to assist Hon. Members, Motion No. 14, for instance, standing in the name of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), changes substantially the definition of the word "grain" as it appears in Clause 2 of the Bill. Motion No. 129, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Vegreville would add to the Bill a new definition "Government contribution to cost increases". May I refer Hon. Members to a ruling of one of my predecessors which can be found at page 61 of *Journals* for October 28, 1970 when he said that, "It is not good procedure to try and introduce a substantive amendment by way of modification of the interpretation clause".

Motions Nos. 20 to 23 inclusive, 28, 36, 41, 54, 57, 80, 81, 85 89 and 166 go beyond the scope of the Bill. For example, Motions Nos. 22 and 23, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), add to Clause 2 new subsections which would impose conditions and burdens on the Canadian Pacific Railway not contemplated in the Bill as agreed to by this House at second reading.

Again, Motion No. 57, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Vegreville, introduces into the Bill a new clause which would allow for agreements to be made between the Minister and the railway companies other than railway companies as defined in Clause 2. Since the Bill covers only those railway companies which come under federal jurisdiction, I find Motion No. 57 to be outside the scope of this Bill.