

Western Grain Transportation Act

total disregard for the parliamentary process. In short, what it has done is cowardly and absolutely reprehensible and I hope Canadians will remember.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is more. When the Bill was introduced after a battery of lawyers and bureaucratic whiz-kids got finished hatching it—and here we have shades of Eddie Clark and the disastrous National Energy Program—only 25 copies were made available to this side of the House and those were not received until late afternoon. Is this parliamentary process? Is this democracy? We thus had but one day to examine the legislation, and upon examination the legislation is a garbled diatribe of the impossible. It reminds me of something an old fellow used to say in the streets of Barrie. It is something “overscious, upstantiuous, plarell, plichadale, platinum plated before sundown”.

Some Hon. Members: Right on!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stewart: If that sounds unintelligible, Mr. Speaker, think on this. The Crow statutory freight rate was seen as necessary for our economic well-being and was simply defined at a rate of one-half a cent per tonne mile. It has now been changed into the following gobbledegook—I will read a little bit of it. This was pointed out by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), who has forgotten more about transportation than the present Minister will ever know.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: Just listen to a short excerpt, Mr. Speaker. In the new piece of legislation, a simple thing like half a cent a tonne mile is now eight paragraphs. I will not take up the time of the House with the whole diatribe because my hon. friend from Vegreville has already read it into the record, but the clauses are eight and they take up better than half a page of *Hansard*. These Clauses read like this:

The annual rate scale in respect of a crop year shall be determined by multiplying the amount per tonne for the movement of grain over each range of distance set out in the base rate scale by the quotient obtained by dividing the estimated eligible costs of the railway companies in respect of that crop year less the CN adjustment in respect of that crop year by the base year revenues within the meaning of subsection (2), as those revenues are adjusted in accordance with the grain tonnage forecast for that crop year—

That is one paragraph.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: Then we have Subclause (4) of Clause 37, which reads:

For the purposes of subsection (2), the “estimated government commitment” means an amount equal to the aggregate of

(a) the Crown Benefit for that crop year divided by 31.1 million tonnes of grain and multiplied by the number of tonnes of grain that, in the estimation of the Administrator—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) is rising on a point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Breau: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order! The Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau), on a point of order.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, I realize the Hon. Member has a right to speak as fast as he wants to, but perhaps I may remind him that there is an interpretation service for Members who do not understand English, and if the Hon. Member speaks this fast, the interpreters will not be able to do their work.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I am not sure what the Chair is expected to do in such circumstances. I did notice the *Hansard* reporter was having considerable difficulty following the Hon. Member. I invite him to resume his speech.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the *Hansard* reporter, but I am reading from *Hansard* at page 25383 for May 12, 1983. I was quoting from the speech of the Hon. Member for Vegreville. I apologize to Brenda, if I may be so bold as to use her name.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. I do not know exactly how to qualify it, but I do not think the Hon. Member should refer to employees or staff of the House of Commons in the way he did.

Mr. Stewart: I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, but it is about time some of the good employees of the House of Commons were recognized.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: At any rate, Mr. Speaker, that is how ludicrous this piece of legislation is, and I hope I have proved a point.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: To add insult to injury, after only two days of debate, once again we have closure. This makes 18 times in this session that, with closure invoked, free speech and the ability as Members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, which I say with pride, to represent our constituents by speaking on their behalf—which is why we are here—have been thwarted or completely garroted. And so the bells rang again. Pourquoi? Why am I speaking now? Because the new rules limit debate to 10 minutes after 8 hours and the Government capitulated to us on closure only because of the time element; otherwise I would be speaking on a closure debate. I hope this does not happen this afternoon, Mr. Government House Leader.

Closure was not necessary, only in a dire circumstance, before this Government came along. That is the only time it is necessary. But we have experienced closure 18 times this