West Coast Ports Operations Bill

Chairman, that now is not the time for a bill before the House to propose such a practice. Now is not the occasion for you to allow such an all-encompassing amendment to be put forward.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has caught my eye. If he has half the intelligence with regard to the rules of the House of Commons that the press attributes to him, then he should know above anybody else in the House that this amendment is completely out of order. Any member of the House should realize that we have been called together here to pass a piece of legislation to aid grain movement, not to bring forward a harum scarum provision put forward by the party to my left which is somewhat chesty today because of its victory in British Columbia. It has brought forward an amendment which is completely out of order, and I urge you to rule it so, so that we can get on with the business of putting the longshoremen back to work and start the grain moving.

I urge the House leader to rise and say, with his vast knowledge of the rules of the House of Commons, that this amendment is out of order. Perhaps he is one member who is equal to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I have no doubt in my mind that the amendment is completely out of order and I urge the House to voice its opinion before we get into a lengthy debate as to what should belong to a given union representing a whole conglomeration of trades in our economic sphere today.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it is close to ten o'clock, I wonder whether you might agree not to see the clock for a further period of time.

Mr. Horner: No, Mr. Chairman. I thought the House leader was rising to give his opinion with regard to this amendment and to give you some advice on whether this amendment is or is not in order. If he is not prepared to do so and does not see the clock, others do and will. We are prepared to deal with the grain handling problem. Let us not deal with unions and the whole scope of unions encompassed in this amendment.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. May I point out, without getting into a debate with the hon. member, that the amendment has been put to the House. When the hon. member rose he said that he wanted to comment on the amendment, and at that time the Chair said that it was considering the amendment as put by the hon. member for Moose Jaw and read to the House. So the question is on the amendment.

Mr. Horner: Ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman. Progress reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): When shall the committee agree to sit again? At the next sitting of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Horner.]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might rise on a point of order and suggest to the House that it might be profitable for us to attempt to complete the committee stage of this bill. I understand that the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) had some comments in the com-

mittee and we could deal with them if we were allowed to go back to complete the committee stage this evening. We would then deal with the third reading of the bill tomorrow. That would be my suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

• (2200

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform you that I have amendments to move to clauses 8 and 11 of the bill. I am prepared to deal with them this evening provided the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) drops or withdraws his rather out of order amendment, so we could then deal with the subject matter before the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The hon. member knows that this would require unanimous agreement. Is there agreement in the House?

Mr. Lewis: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that the issue which was raised in committee by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) was raised because he did not see the text of the amendment. The amendment that was proposed by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) did not deal with unions. It deals precisely with grain handling, and suggests that grain handling be dealt with in a collective agreement separate from any collective agreement that deals with other cargo. The amendment does not deal with unions, as suggested by the hon. member for Crowfoot; it deals with grain handling in the way that he says he wants it dealt with.

In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would change his mind. Because on behalf of my party I wish to agree with the government house leader that it would be desirable to complete the committee of the whole stage this evening and go into third reading stage tomorrow, instead of starting the committee stage all over again tomorrow without being at all certain that we would complete third reading tomorrow. In view of this brief explanation perhaps the hon. member for Crowfoot would reconsider his position on seeing the clock.

Mr. Horner: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I now have a copy of the amendment before me. While I think it is substantively out of order, and having asked the government House leader to give his opinion on whether it is in order or not, and he having neglected to do so, I assume the government is in agreement with this amendment. If the government is in agreement with the amendment, I am in no way reluctant to pass it this evening. I see the Minister of Labour (Mr. O'Connell) shaking his head negatively. The minister does not want to separate the 73 grain handlers from the other 3,200 workers. I believe they should be separated. If we can reach no agreement on that point this evening, then all I can say is that I regret that ten o'clock has arrived so quickly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I understand the point of view of the hon. member, but at this time the question concerns the possibility of an agreement to go beyond ten o'clock and allow the House to resume its committee work. I will put the question again. Is there agreement to allow the House to go back to committee and resume its work on Bill C-231?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.