

Canada Grain Act

and its advisers have at their disposal to have considered the acceptability of each one of them. The Chair has been under the impression that we might not reach the end of that long list by tomorrow. The thought of the Chair was that we might at least start on the first one, which is in order. The second and the third also appear to be in order. That should be enough meat to keep the House interested for the next few minutes.

If for any reason it was decided, for example, that we might sit after the normal adjournment hour tomorrow night to consider the hon. member's other amendments, we might be in a position to make a ruling as to whether they are acceptable.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would agree to our sitting tonight until his amendments have been dealt with.

Mr. Horner: I appreciate the extent of the workload which is placed before the House. It was in these circumstances that I inquired whether you, Mr. Speaker, or your staff, had reached any conclusions about the acceptability of these amendments. Bearing in mind that we are establishing precedents, I thought that question might be posed this evening.

I have read the rules carefully and I see that according to the rules the mover of an amendment is given 40 minutes speaking time. The first amendment in my name is an important one because it deals with the subject of rail line abandonment. But before dealing with it I have a suggestion to make and something in the nature of a request to put forward. As we have heard, I have placed on the Order Paper something like 38 amendments to this bill, and this might well give rise to the question: Why has one particular member done this?

● (8:50 p.m.)

What basic objection do I have to the passage of the bill? I can give my reasons each time I rise to speak to my amendments and then go on to deal with the detail of such amendments. However, what I would like to do is this. I ask permission of the House to explain my basic reasons for suggesting that the bill is badly framed and why I have placed on the Order Paper 38 amendments to a bill that comprises 114 clauses.

If the House feels that I must stick strictly to each amendment as it concerns the whole rationalization of the railways and their problems in western Canada, let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the minister that I can

spend a full 40 minutes on that subject. However, in my initial speech I should like to take a broad approach to the list of amendments. Perhaps the House would give me some guidance in this regard.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the hon. member ranging over a broad field, but I think that what must be borne in mind is that it is extremely important in the minds of the majority of farmers that the bill be passed so that changes in the grading system can be put into effect. Secondly, virtually all the amendments put forward by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and others were thoroughly discussed in the committee. He has the right to revive that discussion; I do not question that. But it does seem to me that there is no useful purpose served in attempting to restrict the hon. member strictly to clause 1, and I do not ask that that be done. It seems to me the hon. member should take the interests of the farmers to heart.

Mr. Horner: I do have them at heart.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) stated the rule correctly when he said that on amendment motions the rules require that speeches made in the course of debate should be strictly relevant to the motion before the House. At the same time the Chair is in the hands of the House. The hon. member seeks permission to make a general speech on the first of his motions. If the House is in agreement, the hon. member will be granted this permission. I am not sure whether it will extend to other hon. members who want to take part in the debate on the first motion proposed by the hon. member, but we will cross that bridge if and when we get to it.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am wondering whether I understand you correctly. Surely on a given amendment there cannot be one judgment for one speaker and another judgment for another. I should like to know from the Chair whether the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is going to be allowed to roam over the whole spectrum of the bill. If so, surely this would apply equally to those who speak to the same amendment. Is that not what the hon. member requested?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Crowfoot.