

regulations examined as Hon. Members of this House who are elected and responsible to their constituents would enjoy.

Motion No. 47 does not remove altogether the ability of Senators to have regulations examined in committee. That kind of slight towards the Senate would, of course, be too much to bear for the Government or my friends in the Tory caucus. The Senate, after all, is the place to which they retire both Tory and Liberal hacks. No, this motion does not slight the Senate in that way. What it does do, though, is recognize the plain and simple fact that Hon. Members and Senators must have at least an equal opportunity to examine, and in some cases reject, regulations proposed for grain transportation. It seems only fitting to me, Mr. Speaker, that elected Members of Parliament should not have more restrictions placed on them in this regard than appointed Senators.

Motions Nos. 48 and 49 deal with the length of time allocated for this House to debate a motion that the proposed regulation be confirmed and brought into effect. As it now stands, a regulation dealing with performance guarantees or awards and sanctions for those involved in the grain transportation system must be laid before each House of Parliament within 15 days. Then a motion must be put that the regulation be confirmed and signed by a Minister of the Crown. That motion is then dealt with by the Senate or the House of Commons, as the case may be.

That is fine as far as it goes. However, what the Government intends with this Bill is to impose a prearranged closure on the debate. The Government has proposed to limit debate to only one hour. If that is all the time the Government feels should be allowed for Members of this House to deal with the motions confirming these regulations, then I must ask, why bother at all? Allowing one hour is the worst kind of tokenism, Mr. Speaker. How much of that hour will Opposition Members receive in order to debate the regulation? Forty minutes? Half an hour? Even a full hour, for that matter, is not very much time for this Government, which has only one Cabinet Member from the West, to allow Opposition Members to deal with regulations which may have long-lasting effects on western grain farmers. It is not very much House time which this Government, which hails largely from central Canada, is allowing western Opposition Members to tell it what is wrong with its proposed regulations for grain transportation.

The motion presented by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) would extend that limit to three days. That makes much more sense, as my friend, the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), suggested. That is our second choice. However, I do not think that is enough. As Hon. Members now know, some of these regulations can be very complicated. And as we are seeing in this debate, it takes more than three days to enlighten the Government on the faults of complicated proposals.

Of course, some of the regulations proposed by the Administrator will be very straightforward and there should be no reason to keep them from being dealt with very quickly. However, I am uncomfortable limiting the debate on these regulations to three days for the simple reason that it may take

Western Grain Transportation Act

more time than that to make all the points which need to be made. If a regulation is bad and is complicated at the same time, it could easily take Hon. Members of this House more than three days to convince the Government that the best route is simply to revoke the motion of confirmation in the regulation.

I am surprised also, Mr. Speaker, that the Tories would want to write in the limit of three days in this particular motion. Over the last few days we have heard that Party, and rightly so, complaining about the three-day closure which we are now suffering. I can only think that perhaps what the Hon. Member had in mind when he drafted this amendment was that since one day his Party may well be in power, he wanted to make sure that some form of closure or time allocation was in place for that eventuality.

For my money, Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 49 makes much more sense. It permits debate on the motions confirming regulations to continue until it is finished. Under this proposal, if it takes four days or even five days to deal with one particular regulation, then Hon. Members know they will have those four or five days to deal with it. They will not be faced with automatic time allocation and prevented from making the points which must be made.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that with these motions we are recognizing that some checks must be in place on the Government's ability to govern by Order in Council. I am happy that the Government seems to recognize that Hon. Members of this House must have the ability to examine, and if need be reject, proposed regulations which will come from the Grain Transportation Administrator. I believe, however, when we are recognizing that need, that we must ensure we are not limiting the ability of Hon. Members of this House in that regard more than we are limiting the ability of Senators. As this Bill now reads, that is exactly what we would be doing. We must ensure that once regulations have been examined in committee, Hon. Members have adequate time, if they need it, to debate those regulations in the House. One hour allowed for each motion confirming a regulation is not enough time. For that matter, neither may three days be enough time. Members should be allowed as much time as they need to debate contentious regulations.

• (1200)

As I have said before, in many cases no written notice will be given to have the regulations examined in committee and no debate will occur on motions to confirm regulations; but there will be times when the regulations must be examined and debated. There will even be times when the motions to confirm the regulations must be—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.