

Canagrex

the ways of socialism, and we would do well to ask the people of Russia, Cuba or China how they benefit from such an education. The creation of another Crown corporation such as Canagrex simply expands the concept of state control and socialism. That is a dangerous and destructive concept.

I see you are waving at me, Mr. Speaker, so I will conclude by simply saying this. Through its embrace of and dedication to socialism, this Government has created very grave problems for Canada and this is the latest and worst of them. Socialism in the hands of this Prime Minister has taken on a new form and meaning. It has, as this Bill amply demonstrates, become nothing less than communization. I am convinced, and with good reason, that the Prime Minister, given his way, would turn this nation into a huge organized commune in which every single aspect of our lives would be controlled by Government.

Mr. Ferguson: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the rule of relevance be applied here and that we get back to the amendments, please.

Mr. Taylor: You are the last one to be referring to that.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: What is relevant to you may not be relevant to me.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) on the same point of order.

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a series of amendments, the first of which changes the concept of this Bill. It seems to me that if we are to deal properly with the first amendment, plus the others grouped with it, we have to have a wide scope to speak on the subject matter.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Chair thanks Hon. Members for their contributions to the procedural matter. As a matter of fact, the time allocated to the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart) had in fact expired and the Chair had proposed to rise at that point so as not to interrupt the Hon. Member in his remarks to refer Hon. Members to procedural paper No. 2, dealing with rules respecting repetition and relevance in debate. I would like to quote the following paragraph:

Motions which are amendments to change, to delete or to restore clauses in the bill can be moved and debated at this stage.

I am referring to report stage. It goes on:

To avoid excessive repetition of debate, the Speaker has the power to select and to combine motions and amendments.

This was done previously as Hon. Members know. It goes on:

Also, the Speaker can control debate through use of irrelevancy rule as applied to debate on clauses of a bill. Despite the resemblance of debate at report stage to that at committee stage, there is no allowance in the Standing Orders of the House for a wide-ranging discussion of a bill as occurs by practice in committee on study of clause 1.

When the Hon. Member for Simcoe South rose to make his speech, he said specifically that he would address his remarks to Clause 1 of the Bill. The Chair waited with some patience, I may say, to the Hon. Member to speak with some greater relevance to the amendments at hand. Along the way the Hon.

Member did touch on some of the general contents of those amendments.

Because of the large grouping of amendments, it is, of course, rather difficult for the Chair to determine on the spot if a Member is speaking to any one of the more than half a dozen amendments we are now debating together. Therefore, I would invite Hon. Members to make as much as possible a determined effort to relate their remarks to the specific amendments now before the House. Otherwise the Chair will have no other choice but to invite Hon. Members to relate their remarks in fact to those amendments.

Taking into account, as I have just said, that the amendments are numerous but in a sense are all related to each other, hopefully we will be able to make progress in the debate.

• (1200)

The Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) rises on a point of order?

Mr. Skelly: On this point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am pursuing the matter of relevance. I can see that it will be a problem throughout the day in that in Beauchesne's Citation 102 there is the indication that the question of relevance must address the question of rationality. I believe that any intelligent examination of the remarks of the Hon. Member who spoke previously would indicate that the speech was absolutely irrational. Therefore, I feel that he was not relevant in what he was dealing with in the matter. He should probably have been ruled out of order immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I thank the Hon. Member but, of course, that is a matter of opinion. The Chair has wide discretion in the exercise of its judgment. I am attempting to do an objective job of assessing, if I may use that term, Hon. Members' remarks as they relate to the matter at hand. It is not an easy task, mind you, especially in the context of today's debate.

I now recognize the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw for debate.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I can understand the concern of my friends to the left with respect to some of the remarks which have been made here this morning. It is hitting home, I think, and it is an indication as to how closely allied they are with the Government, which is attempting to put forward a Bill that is entirely in keeping with the philosophy of those on my left.

It is a sad day for Canada, as the Hon. Member who spoke previously said. We are faced here with a Bill restricted to two days of debate by a motion of closure, two days of debate which cover not only the third reading stage but also the second reading stage. We are faced with some ten or 12 substantial amendments to the Bill. We as Members should have been given the opportunity to spend a considerable amount of time on these amendments.