

Western Grain Transportation Act

Motion No. 20, the Chair will recognize another Hon. Member who had sought the floor. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone).

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I was just rising in an attempt to try to be helpful to you. Since I noted that you were having some difficulty with points of order raised by Members of the New Democratic Party, might I commend to your attention how the Speaker in the legislature in British Columbia handles that Party.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I will recognize the Hon. Member for Regina West.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, on a similar point of order, I am not as heavy as the fellow in British Columbia, so I suppose I would be easier to remove, but I know Your Honour would not want to be bereft of my company.

I do not think I need to remind the Chair that the Chair invited the House to comment on three efficient sets of documents on which the Chair made preliminary rulings and, in the third document, reasons for unacceptability, on a total of 174 amendments. In all reasonableness, how are Hon. Members of the House, in the matter of a day or two, to go over every individual amendment, to check it with the Speaker's preliminary ruling, to compare it with—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order.

Mr. Benjamin:—what went on in the committee, to compare it to the original Bill, the Bill as it was reported back? I defy anyone to be able to deal with that in that amount of time. We have had an open invitation from the Chair, quite properly I submit, for Hon. Members to rise on a point of order to put forth arguments as to why they think a motion is acceptable and in order or why it is not acceptable or in order, and that is a proper decision of the Chair. I want to tell Your Honour that I have points of order to raise with regard to a number of other amendments, as to their acceptability, their admissibility, and so do my colleagues. Since these coal lands are all located in the riding of my colleague, Your Honour can understand and appreciate that he may stray for a moment or two from the point of order, but I am sure Your Honour can understand it. You would, too, if those lands were in your riding. Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I think the Hon. Member for Regina West has done a very considerable favour to the House. He and I have now had an exchange of views. I understand he and other Members of his Party have a number of points of order to raise. At the same time he has indicated that he wants to keep his points of order brief, to the point, and within the procedural understanding of the House of Commons. I think that is a perfect understanding. Hopefully, the Hon. Member will proceed and perhaps allow other Hon. Members to have the floor in as short a time period as possible so they, too, will have their rights.

• (1650)

The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) for a moment.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to appear to be monopolizing the floor. If other Members wish to speak, I will gladly give way to them on points of order on any of the motions which the Chair has some doubts about.

On Motion No. 16 the Chair has a preliminary ruling that says Motions Nos. 15, 16, 17 and 134 give the Chair similar problems. It appears to the Chair to be a substantive amendment to the interpretation clause and beyond the scope of the Bill. I want to argue in the case of Motion No. 16, the effect of which is to retain the statutory grain rate for the producers. It does not violate the long title. It does not call upon larger government expenditures. The funds provided for in the legislation, \$651 million, will still be paid out. It in no way affects the Royal Recommendation. Now to the scope of the Bill. The Bill outlines a scale of rates in Schedule II, what is called the base rate scale. That Bill is the statutory grain rate as it relates to mileage. Motion No. 16 does nothing more than maintain the base rate scale outlined in Schedule II of the Bill. How in the devil does that go beyond the scope of the Bill? All it does is to maintain what is provided in the Bill, namely the base rate scale in Schedule II. I will not presume upon the patience of the Chair and read the whole darn thing, much as I would like to.

The maximum shipper share of the rate of cost change means zero, which is what my Motion No. 16 is. All it does is to maintain Schedule II which is in the Bill. How the dickens does that go beyond the scope of the Bill? Please, Mr. Speaker, will you and your officials spend this weekend coming up with an answer to that? I would appreciate it. On all sides of the House as well as across the country the pros and cons of maintaining the statutory grain rate for the grain producers are well known. The Bill outlines the statutory grain rate in Schedule II. Therefore, I submit to the Chair that Motion No. 16 does not go beyond the scope of the Bill.

Let us look at Motion No. 15.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I think it is only fair, and the Hon. Member for Regina West is known for his views of fairness, that other Hon. Members who might want to speak to amendments in terms of points of order, be given that opportunity. The Chair will recognize other Hon. Members. Of course, I will return to the Hon. Member for Regina West on the next amendment. As I do not see another Hon. Member rising, I will recognize the Hon. Member for Regina West on Motion No. 17, I believe?

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I want to make the same submission as it relates to Motion No. 17. Pardon me, Motion No. 19 and Motion No. 70 appear beyond the scope of the Bill and in effect seek to destroy the Bill. Motion No. 19 reads:

—"tariff" means the tariff of rates and conditions of carriage for the movement of grain that were in effect on the sixteenth day of June, 1983.