

purpose is, to allow the Canadian people to participate equitably in the profits which may be realized from any activity in the private sector. I often feel that Hon. Members in the New Democratic Party tend to forget that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thacker: Mr. Speaker, the Minister spoke about winners and losers. I wonder if he would agree with me that the livestock industry and secondary processing industry will surely have to feel that they are losers, because the original Gilson compromise had 81 per cent of the money going to farmers and 19 per cent to the railways, which was designed to do away with the distortion which the Crow rate had come to cause over the years. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) then knocked that down to fifty-fifty and as a result of the representations of the Quebec caucus it went down to 100 per cent to the railways and zero to the producers. Does the Minister not agree that the livestock industry is the loser in that context?

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, in the long term everyone is a winner out of this proposed initiative. As I understand the formula, if you take the Lakehead feed grain price and deduct the cost of transportation, certainly it will reduce at a slower pace than might have been the case under the other proposal. However, everyone is a winner under this proposal and the winning is just a little slower than it would have been under the first proposal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Last Friday afternoon the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) raised a point of order which maintained that the ten minutes allowed for questions and comments following Members' speeches in the eight-hour period, at second reading of Bills, should not be counted as being a part of that eight-hour period. The Chair heard arguments on Friday afternoon, has considered the arguments raised during the weekend, and is now ready to rule on the matter.

In addition to those arguments, in coming to a conclusion the Chair considered the third report to the House of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure, the present Provisional Standing Orders, as well as our practice established since the coming into force of the Provisional Standing Orders.

The third report of the Special Committee sets out specifically a new procedure for second reading of Bills which it splits into three distinct periods, and I quote from that report:

Your Committee recommends that the first three speakers be limited to forty minutes each, allowing for a contribution from the three Parties, but not to be followed by ten-minute exchanges. This would then be followed by speeches of a maximum length of twenty minutes for the first eight hours followed by ten-minute exchanges in each case, if required. Thereafter speeches would be limited to ten minutes without the provisions for exchanges.

The Chair understands that the Special Committee intended the ten-minute period to be included in the eight hours.

Secondly, it seems evident from reading the specific Standing Order 35(2), which sets out expressly these three distinct periods, that the second of those periods in subparagraph (b) provides for a total period of eight hours during which

speeches will be limited to 20 minutes in length and may be followed by ten minutes of questions and comments.

Thirdly, our practice, as developed since the beginning of this year, confirms the intent of the report and the Provisional Standing Orders in that sense. The ten-minute questions, answers and comment period has always been included within the eight hours.

I thank Hon. Members for bringing this matter to the Chair's attention as it has permitted a study of the matter. It is my conclusion that the time taken for the ten-minute question and answer period must be added to the actual time of speeches in determining the total eight-hour period during the second segment of consideration of second reading of a Bill.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a new point of order for your consideration, having ruled on what I thought was a valid point of order raised by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), with respect to the interpretation of the new rules. We all understand that this is on a temporary basis and we must look at the rules as they are in fact in the Standing Orders now during this trial period.

My point of order relates to another aspect on which I would ask for a ruling from the Chair. The wording of the new Standing Orders with respect to time limits on speeches relates to different stages in the proceedings, whether it be second reading or indeed with respect to any state of the proceedings. What it is silent on, though, is with respect to the rules which will apply in the event, as we now have it in this particular debate, of an amendment being brought forward by a Member which is accepted by the Chair on second reading. Therefore, the Hon. Member for Regina West rose and moved a motion, which is accepted by the Chair, to put a completely new and novel dimension on this debate in terms of the subject matter for consideration by the House.

His motion, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, was simply that this matter not be now debated but be suspended for consideration for a period of six months. That puts a new item before the House for consideration, Mr. Speaker. When we look at the rules and at the Standing Orders, it refers to eight hours with respect to the matter under consideration. It does not talk about second reading. It talks about a stage or item under consideration. My submission to you, Mr. Speaker, is that when a motion, particularly in the case of second reading motions, is brought forward, as we know, we are very much limited in the type of amendment which is acceptable and will be accepted by the Chair under our rules on second reading. There are very few amendments which are acceptable on the part of the Chair. Therefore, when we do have a motion of amendment which, in effect, is accepted by the Chair and by the House, it seems to me only reasonable that we should have full opportunity of examining that matter which is then under consideration.

This is a matter of some considerable substance. This is an excellent Bill on which to raise this point because what the Government is purporting to do under this legislation is not a