

Western Grain Transportation Act

motions are simply going to be added to the Order Paper, the chances are they will not be debated.

Would there be a disposition on the part of the Members of the House to have these motions brought forth for immediate debate? If debate on them is concluded, then we could go on to the other motions appearing on the Order Paper. It would seem to me that we on this side particularly would like to debate these issues. I assume that other Members would see fit that that be done as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have an observation at this point which might be helpful. We have before us Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 on which debate has taken place but was not concluded. Would it be possible for the House to conclude its debate on these motions or stand them, if the House wishes? Is it possible for the House Leaders or representatives of the Parties to get together and come to some agreement which could be presented to the House as to how they wish to proceed at this point?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, assuming that is possible—I imagine we can find the Government House Leader—what the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) is essentially asking is for the Chair to see if there is consent to go on with these fundamental items and stand the others so that there will be an opportunity to debate them.

I will certainly take the initiative and seek out the Government House Leader and, along with the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), see what we can do with the rest, but in the meantime perhaps all other motions could be stood and we could proceed with the Minister's safety net proposal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The suggestion of the Hon. Member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is eminently sensible. But there are one or two observations from the Chair. First, it appears that some motions are similar. It appears that they might be grouped for debate and it appears they might even be grouped for votes.

Mr. Nielsen: Only one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, but other motions were presented today. These might well be details that could be ironed out in private discussions among the representatives of the Parties. The Chair suggests that until such time as there is agreement, perhaps we could proceed with Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49, and possibly dispose of them. Or we could interrupt the debate or set them aside until there is an agreement for an alternative way for the House to proceed.

Mr. Nielsen: May I suggest, because of the fundamental nature of the amendments proposed by the Minister, the other two Parties and the independent Member, following the proposal of the Hon. Member for Vegreville, who has asked the Chair to reserve the matter, that we now proceed with the Minister's suggestion on the safety net and stand everything prior to that? There is only one amendment on the safety net. Let us proceed with that now. Let the House Leaders get

together immediately to determine how we should proceed with the other amendments introduced today.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government I am prepared to give consent that we now prioritize the amendments that have been presented in order to focus debate on significant items.

I do think the Hon. Member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is slightly mistaken. I do believe the NDP also presented an amendment regarding a safety net. However, I suggest that if you look at the basic thrust of the amendments, aside from the one on export which the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) has presented, at which we are looking favourably, there are two issues being looked at. One is the ability to pay and how we provide some protection on that issue, and the second is the method of payment issue and how the review period can be properly and effectively used and ultimately recognized by Parliament in 1985-1986. Those are two key issues. It would seem to me that if we could group debates around those issues, it would stand the Canadian people in good stead to debate then before we conclude report stage. If that is what they want to hear about and if that is the kind of exchange they want to have, then I would seek a way, either by House Leaders or by myself, of meeting with the Opposition critics to see if we could find a way of debating, certainly over tomorrow, those two key issues centring around the amendments that were presented today. I think we could do a real service to the public by doing that.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, we are not in a position to agree to that at the moment. We remember what happened to us on the day the time allocation motion was moved and how the Conservatives cut us out of the debate.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deans: We would be reluctant to enter into any kind of an arrangement sight unseen.

An Hon. Member: What a phoney!

Mr. Deans: The fact of the matter is that all of the amendments that we have before us are important, all of the amendments, not only the most recent ones, but all of the other amendments which are standing on the Notice Paper and have been waiting there for some time for debate. We are prepared, as we always are, to move through, as expeditiously as possible the amendments as they appear on the Notice Paper. If, as and when we get to the most recent amendments, we will debate them in the most learned and knowledgeable way, as we always do.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, if the New Democratic Party insists on debating frivolous amendments and leaving the issues, such as the very important issue of the producers' ability to pay and the method of payment, very fundamental issues, that go to the very central core of this legislation—

An Hon. Member: You can't be trusted.