

*Western Grain Transportation Act*

existing definitions substantially or to add new definitions substantive in scope is not procedurally acceptable.

Hon. Members have argued that Motion No. 14 was consequential to Motion No. 164 and therefore should be put to the House for debate. This does not alter the fact that Motion No. 14 proposes a substantive change to an interpretation clause and as such is irregular. The fact that the Chair has not accepted Motion No. 14 does not affect the admissibility of Motion No. 164, which can stand on its own.

The Hon. Member for Yukon argued that Motion No. 145 was not necessarily consequential to Motion No. 129. After having reviewed the Hon. Member's arguments and having reconsidered the two motions, I am still convinced that Motion No. 129 proposes a substantial change to an interpretation clause and therefore is not acceptable. However, in relation to Motion No. 145, I have to agree with the Hon. Member that it is not necessarily consequential to Motion No. 129 and that it should be put to the House.

The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Flis) referred to the fact that several motions to delete certain definitions in Clause 34 and Clause 54 were consequential to motions upon which the Chair had some doubt as to their acceptability. While there might appear to be some relationship between those motions, it does not alter the fact that certain of the motions delete lines in the Bill, and a motion to delete stands by itself. Therefore, with regret, I have no alternative but to rule Motions Nos. 2 to 19 inclusive, 59, 64, 66, 67, 70, 129, 134 and 135 out of order.

I would like to turn to the next grouping of motions about which I had some doubt as to their procedural acceptability, namely Motions Nos. 20 to 23 inclusive, 28, 36, 41, 54, 57, 80, 81, 85, 89 and 166. In my statement to the House on October 6 I indicated to Hon. Members that these motions appeared to go beyond the scope of the Bill.

● (1530)

After hearing the arguments, the Chair has not been convinced otherwise, with two exceptions. Motions Nos. 36 and 41, as argued by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), merely restrict the powers of the Administrator as provided for in the Bill. The Hon. Member's explanation has raised enough doubt in the mind of the Chair to allow these two motions to be put to the House. It is my intention to group Motion No. 36 with a previous grouping, namely, Motion Nos. 37 and 38. Each motion should be voted on separately. Motion No. 41 will be grouped with Motions Nos. 42, 43, 44, 45 and 46, with separate votes on each motion.

Before concluding my ruling on this grouping, I wish to inform the House that I have carefully studied the extensive remarks of Hon. Members in relation to Motion No. 57. Even though it was argued that the intent of this motion was similar to that of Motion No. 156, it is not the role of the Chair to rule on the intent of Hon. Members in proposing motions but only to rule on the procedural acceptability of these motions. The Chair still finds Motion No. 57 to be outside the scope of the

Bill. I must therefore rule that Motions Nos. 20 to 23 inclusive, 28, 54, 57, 80, 81, 85, 89 and 166 are out of order.

The next grouping concerns Motions Nos. 87, 139, 146, 147, 150, 153, 155 and 165. All of these motions, with the exception of Motion No. 153, go beyond the principle of the Bill as agreed to at second reading.

In the case of Motion No. 153, the contribution of the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has raised sufficient doubts in my mind and I propose to allow this motion to be put to the House. I intend to group this motion with Motion No. 154 for debate, but they will be voted on separately.

The Hon. Member for Yukon also commented on Motion No. 155. This motion seeks to authorize payments to parties other than the railway companies, which is not contemplated in the Bill. This is contrary to the principle of the Bill as agreed to at second reading. For this reason I must rule Motion No. 155 out of order.

After careful study, the Chair is still convinced that Motion Nos. 87, 139, 146, 147, 150 and 165 are contrary to or beyond the principle of the Bill, and I therefore rule them out of order.

Motions Nos. 104 to 114 inclusive, 172 and 173 infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown, as I indicated in my preliminary statement on Thursday last. Motions Nos. 104 to 114 inclusive, if allowed, would permit a shipment in excess of 31.1 million tonnes to qualify for the Crow benefit, and Motions Nos. 172 and 173 would add new crops to Schedule I. These motions would involve expenditures not covered by the Royal Recommendation or would extend the objects and purposes or relax the conditions and qualifications as expressed in that Recommendation. For the benefit of Hon. Members, I refer them to Citation 773(7) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition.

As I indicated on Thursday last, Motions Nos. 51, 73, 86 and 151 are contrary to the principle of the Bill and infringe upon the Crown's financial initiative. The Hon. Member for Yukon suggested that Motion No. 86 would have the effect of decreasing the charges on the public purse and hence does not infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown. While the Chair is persuaded by this argument, the motion is, nonetheless, still contrary to the principle of the Bill in that it proposes to freeze the prescribed rate charged by railway companies to producers for the movement of grain, whereas the Bill, as agreed to at second reading, contemplates an annual rate change under certain conditions. In my mind, this renders the motion contrary to the principle of the Bill and is therefore unacceptable. Motions Nos. 51, 73 and 151 are also ruled out of order.

On October 6 I stated that Motions Nos. 74, 152 and 157 are new propositions which are clearly outside the scope of the Bill. I went on to say that Motion No. 157 proposes to place in the Bill a new Part IV concerning "Shipper Share Limitations". The argument presented by Hon. Members has not convinced me that this is not a new concept. While protecting the farmers may be a highly desirable addition to the Bill and is, as far as the Chair can see, acceptable to many Members of the House, it is not procedurally in order, and that is the only