

that was the intent of the Bill, we were told that it was not. We were told that the intent of the Bill was to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof. Although it may appear at first gloss to be a point of some irrelevance, it is in fact a fundamental point when regarded in consideration of the intent of the Bill and the amendments that might be acceptable.

I would therefore ask the Chair to consider that. I would want to argue at a later date, in quite a different vein, the admissibility of certain amendments that are before us if the Chair does indeed rule that the sole or even primary purpose of the Bill was to amend the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. I contend that if we deal with the statutory grain rate, then of course some of my argument will be quite different from what it would have been, taking into account what the Bill says, and what we were told repeatedly the Bill says, and what its intent is.

I wonder if the Speaker would care to comment on that in order to determine what course to follow.

Madam Speaker: Of course, it is not for the Speaker to determine what the full intention of the Bill is. The Hon. Member was referring to page 3 of my statement where I was certainly paraphrasing but giving an argument by way of an example that a certain amendment would be out of order since certain clauses of the Bill are intended to change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate and that whatever amendment I was discussing would mean exactly the contrary. I was giving this as an explanation of the way arguments can be mounted to say that a certain amendment is contrary to the principle of the Bill.

It is not for the Chair to determine the entire scope of the Bill, but it can determine that certain amendments go contrary to the expressed intentions within the Bill.

Mr. Deans: I appreciate that, Madam Speaker. The problem is that it poses a terrible dilemma. If the Bill is for the purpose of facilitating the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, then it is not unreasonable to propose amendments that deal strictly with the shipping and handling of grain as they are contained in the Bill. Some of the amendments are ruled out because they go beyond the scope of the bill. They would go beyond the scope of the Bill if the Bill were solely for the purpose of providing new rates for the movement of grain through the Crowsnest Pass. We are in a rather confused situation.

● (1700)

We have argued that the Bill was misnamed, that the Bill ought to have been called something else because that would then clearly define what its intent was. Therefore, you would know when you were going beyond the intent of the Bill. But in this case we are faced with the problem that the Bill says it does one thing when it does another. The Speaker has picked up very quickly on what it actually does, and has, in fact,

Western Grain Transportation Act

incorporated that on page 3 of the statement, which is what we have argued all along. I find that under normal circumstances this sort of confusion would never arise. In this case, because we are going to deal with—and I will not try right now to deal with it—the admissibility or the inadmissibility of the definition section, which would clear up the question, we are going to be faced with a dilemma. I just raise that for the Chair's consideration.

I understand the Speaker cannot change what is written on the face of the Bill. But what is written on the face of the Bill is not in any way the interpretation that any normal reasonable person, like yourself, Madam Speaker, could come to in reading the Bill.

Madam Speaker: Could the Hon. Member, if he disagrees with that particular statement, enlighten the Chair and tell the Chair in what way the amendment he proposes fits or does not fit into the Bill? That would be of great interest to the Chair. The reason for which this period of debate is taking place is to allow Members to help the Chair in case the Chair has not fully understood the meaning of certain of those clauses, especially not having participated in the total debate that took place around this Bill, and has failed to understand exactly what was meant by certain amendments. It would be helpful if the Hon. Member could tell me exactly where he feels this fits or does not fit into the Bill.

Mr. Deans: That will be part of my submission, Madam Speaker. I think, if you will allow me, I will introduce it as I go along and show you where I think that does infringe upon some of the amendments, rather than to pick them out right now and take undue time and probably infringe upon the time of my colleague who has a substantive statement to make about his views. I will do it as I unveil my views on what is wrong with certain of the proposals.

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): I will try to be very brief, Madam Speaker. I will speak first with regard to Motions Nos. 14, 74 and 157. It is my belief that it was the clear intention of the Government, perhaps not of the House, and it was accepted by the committee, that there would be amendments at report stage of the Bill brought in by the Government to do things with the Bill that were impossible for the committee to do because of the lack of the Royal Recommendation.

Mr. Deans: That is too bad.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): That would include the definition of grain by adding extra crops. If the definition of grain is static and cannot be changed except by an Act of Parliament, I suggest, Madam Speaker, that it will render the Bill rather stiff and inoperative because it will mean that new crops that should rightly be recipients of the Crow benefit would not be eligible without another Act of Parliament.

I do not think the Government or the House intended the Bill to be that restrictive in its nature. I would argue that this