

Western Grain Transportation Act

● (0015)

[English]

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a serious point of order if I could have about two minutes. It has been over two hours since we commenced the debate on Motions Nos. 55 and 56. That means that we are using one hour per amendment. There are 174 amendments on the Order Paper, of which we have considered 56. That leaves 118 amendments remaining. If we divide 24 hours into 118 motions, it comes to five full days. In other words, we will require ten full days to complete the debate. I suggest we are not being fair to Canadians when we spend all this time on one or two amendments. Surely Hon. Members can get to the point in a reasonable amount of time so that we can cover all amendments. If we do not accomplish that, the New Democratic Party will be just as guilty as was the Liberal Party in bringing in time allocation, because it is stopping us from debating some very important motions.

Mr. Waddell: A point of order.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I think the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) made an excellent point. However, why did his party waste a whole day preventing debate on Bill C-155 by presenting petitions which could have been tabled?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Hon. Members are not making points of order.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). I sympathize with him. We are not moving swiftly through the amendments, but they are very controversial matters. Adequate time has to be taken to deal with them. I am hopeful that by tomorrow, Wednesday or Thursday we will have reached the amendment in which he is particularly interested, but in the meantime he has to show some patience.

Mr. Waddell: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has heard a number of interventions which were not really points of order. If the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) really has a point of order, the Chair will hear it.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the last point of Order so that Your Honour can rule on it. It seems to me—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has ruled that no one has really raised a point of order. The Chair has listened patiently to Hon. Members, but it is convinced that no points of order were raised. If the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway has a point of order, the Chair will hear it.

The Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant).

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, you did not say that with any great deal of enthusiasm.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is a little late in the day. The Chair does its best. The Hon. Member has been recognized.

Mr. Sargeant: I am well aware of that. I will do my best as well. I welcome the opportunity to speak once again on a group of amendments to this very important piece of legislation before the House of Commons.

Mr. Taylor: You don't have to tell us ten more times; you have already done it 20 times now.

Mr. Sargeant: I especially thank Hon. Members of the Conservative Party for providing me with an opportunity to rise at 12.30 in the morning of November 1 and debate this piece of legislation. I point out, however, to the Hon. Member from dinosaur that we in the New Democratic Party are not especially greedy. If they want to take their turn at debating the legislation—

Mr. Taylor: We do not want an opportunity to say the same thing over and over.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has recognized the Hon. Member for the purpose of debate on Motions Nos. 55 and 56. I draw the attention of Hon. Members to the fact that this is report stage and that debate should be strictly relevant to the motions before the House.

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, if you could keep this gaggle of geese over here quiet, I could deal with the amendments before the House.

Mr. Forrestall: Get your hands out of your pockets and stand up straight when you speak to the Chair.

Mr. Sargeant: We are debating Motions Nos. 55 and 56 which have been moved by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). Motion No. 55 reads in part:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 33 by striking out lines 11 to 43 at page 16 and substituting the following therefor;

"for the purpose of moving grain and the Minister shall take every reasonable initiative to ensure that an adequate supply of rolling stock will be provided for the efficient, reliable and effective movement of grain.

It is time the Government got around to requiring the railways, or indeed some agency in the country, to live up to the mandate of moving grain for the benefit of producers and farmers.

I am not an expert on farm issues. I did not grow up on a farm. The town in which I grew up and still live in is not really a farming community. There are some farmers in the surrounding area, but its main source of income was for many years a Canadian Air Force base and a large fishing industry. I did not grow up with farming in my blood as have some of my friends in the House. However, I represent a constituency with a good number of farmers. In fact, some parts of it have a number of grain farmers, many of whom are concerned about this piece of legislation. One thing I learned before getting into politics and realizing where events were taking me and that I would have to apprise myself of the concerns of the Selkirk-Interlake constituency was that for many years the railways in