

grouping amendments, consulted the movers of the amendments to agree on their grouping.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I understand the hon. member's suggestion. The Chair is about to put forward suggestions with which it is hoped hon. members will agree in order to facilitate the debate. Of course, the hon. members in whose names the motions stand are primarily concerned and I agree that their wishes might well be considered, but hon. members realize the Chair has authority to make the grouping. However, the Chair would not want to force it on hon. members who are reluctant to accept it.

Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3 inclusive relate to subclause (c) of clause 2 and it is suggested that these three motions be grouped for the purpose of debate but that the question on each be put separately.

**Mr. Horner:** Mr. Speaker, I realize your grouping is final in this instance, but it might be advisable to seek—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I thought I had indicated that these groupings, at least in the opinion of the Chair, at this point are not final. I would hope they would be and I believe there is general consent, but I do not want to impose the suggestions I have in mind on the hon. member for Crowfoot, although I hope he will accept them.

**Mr. Horner:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interruption by the Chair because I have always worked on a very sparse margin of hope. I suggest that you consider grouping amendments Nos. 1, 5 and 22. In so doing we would still be taking three amendments together. I might briefly explain the reason. If one quickly reads amendment No. 1 he will see it suggests basically that no commodity group be included in the bill.

The argument put forward repeatedly by the minister and the chairman of the committee has been that this is permissive and enabling legislation. The context of amendments 1, 5 and 22 basically is that the bill would be made enabling or permissive legislation. The order paper, however, lists these amendments in the order of the clauses in the bill. In other words, clause 2 automatically comes before clause 18. Amendment No. 22 deals with clause 18. The intent of the amendment to clause 18, the intent of the amendment to clause 5 and the intent of the amendment to clause 2(c) would make the bill permissive and enabling legislation, as the proponents of the bill suggest. That is why I object.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3, to take the other amendments which Your Honour suggests should be grouped, state in essence that all farm products should be in the bill except, as No. 2 suggests, cattle and calves and, as No. 3 suggests, except hogs and pork products. There is a basic difference. No. 1 suggests that nobody shall be included unless they request to be included and can prove to the minister and the Governor in Council that the majority of the producers want inclusion. In order to give that amendment some teeth, further amendments have to be moved to clause 2(g) and clause 18(1) and (2).

#### *Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

I would rather Your Honour followed the pattern of grouping amendments and calling on the movers, to better understand their intent on moving these amendments, rather than grouping them in the way suggested. The Chair might then better follow the intent of the amendments, the debate would become very much simpler and it would be clearer for Your Honour to rule on the amendments.

As I understand it, the purpose of grouping amendments is to create a situation in which Your Honour can rule a certain speech in order or out of order. The speeches at report stage must pertain to the amendment specified. I do not object to the authority of the Chair to group amendments, but I believe that in future it will be better to have consultation with the movers of amendments so that their intent in moving the amendment can be considered. The debate would then follow the intent of motions so grouped.

I suggest to hon. members, the government House leader and Your Honour—the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and the chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture are not here—that owing to the efforts of the assistant government whip a few minutes ago and in light of the argument I have put forward with regard to grouping, perhaps we should now call it ten o'clock. A regrouping of amendments could take place tomorrow morning before the bill is debated. I would be in favour of that; I think it would facilitate early agreement on how these amendments should be dealt with.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair would like to read a suggestion into the record so that hon. members, particularly the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), might have an opportunity, in line with this suggestion, to give further consideration to the manner in which the motions should be grouped. This will be done with the assurance that it is no more than a suggestion. It will form a basis for consideration by hon. members overnight and tomorrow, particularly hon. members in whose names the motions stand, as to the way in which the Chair feels the groups might be made. Again, these are only suggestions.

Of the 30 motions to amend Bill C-176, it would appear that only motion No. 30 is defective from a procedural point of view in that the motion seems to amend the Export and Import Permits Act. An opportunity to submit procedural argument might be deferred until that motion is called for consideration.

Motions Nos. 1 to 3 inclusive relate to subclause (c) of clause 2. It is suggested that those three motions be grouped for the purpose of debate, but that the question on each be put separately. It is suggested that motions Nos. 4 and 5 be debated and disposed of separately. It is suggested that any deferred division then standing might be disposed of before proceeding to part I of the bill.

It is suggested that motions Nos. 6, 7 and 8 be grouped for the purpose of debate, but the question on each be put separately. It is suggested that motion No. 9 be considered and disposed of separately. Motions Nos. 10 and 11 could be grouped for debate and disposed of with one vote. Motion No. 12 might be considered and dis-