

United Aircraft

Sympathetic as I am to that particular conflict, I know that the province of Quebec has a responsibility for labour relations within the province. It is not for me as a member of this House to indicate to them how they should discharge that responsibility. I can understand that the leader of the NDP, or rather the potential leader of the NDP, has no party in the province of Quebec and has to use this chamber to indicate what they ought to do at the provincial level. But that is not my role, or the role of any member of the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Madam Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member recalls the gist of the point of order that he raised about 50 minutes ago.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): As a matter of fact I was just about to call the hon. member to order. Perhaps I should let the hon. member know that the motion deals with correspondence between United Aircraft and the government.

Mr. Blais: I fully agree, Madam Speaker, and I am not one to abuse the rules of the House. If I was carried away, it was because of the persuasiveness of my own argument. I might indicate to the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby that he actually has the information he is seeking, in an answer given him in the House.

I had three other arguments I wanted to put, Madam Speaker, but I think the most viable one is this. We are dealing with a clause in a contract that allegedly prohibits United Aircraft from transferring work to the United States. I point out to the hon. member that there have been \$92 million worth of federal funds invested in this corporation. In order to protect that investment a judgment was exercised by the federal government, and was provided in the answer. That judgment was to permit United Aircraft to keep its competitiveness by transferring work to the United States, with the assurance that the work would come back. I suggest to the hon. member that had that assurance not been obtained, that strike would have destroyed United Aircraft. Thank you for your patience, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

[Mr. Blais.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

WESTERN GRAIN STABILIZATION ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING THE STABILIZATION OF NET PROCEEDS FROM THE PRODUCTION AND SALE OF WESTERN GRAIN

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lang that Bill C-41, respecting the stabilization of net proceeds from the production and sale of western grain and to amend certain statutes in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, before the dinner hour I was suggesting that this party supports the principle of stabilizing incomes for farmers because farmers, perhaps more than anyone else in our country, have to live with the open market system, with existing weather patterns, and are subject to international markets which they can no longer control, and in addition they have to live with the Liberals, never knowing what they are going to do.

The farmers have to meet many uncertainties in respect of income from what they produce. The time has long since passed when the government should have taken the responsibility of stabilizing the income of farmers. This has been the foundation policy of this party and of the CCF before it. We have always said that we should have a farm stabilization program with marketing boards, so we can market farm products in an orderly fashion. These are things this party has advocated for years. There must be guaranteed prices. When the farmer plants his crop in the spring he has no idea what he will get for that crop when he sells it in the fall. This discriminates against the small farmer and squeezes him out of business because he is the guy who has to compete with big agribusiness and the big producer.

This bill is an improvement over the 1971 bill. I thought the minister had learned a few things since then, but perhaps he has not learned enough. When this bill goes to committee there are a number of changes that I and others in my party would like to see adopted. I am sure the farmers would like to have these changes made in the bill as well.

The most important thing we must do as members of parliament is make sure that the agriculture committee holds public hearings throughout the country so that the farmers' union, the Federation of Agriculture, and any other grain group will have the opportunity of contributing some input to this grain stabilization program.

This piece of legislation will fundamentally change the income status of many grain farmers. It is important that the changes are made in their best interest rather than the best interest of anyone else. There are a number of other things that should be changed. I referred earlier to the fact that pay-outs are to be made on a total or global basis, and this is discriminatory.

Let me give an example. There may be a poor quality crop in my area with wheat of grade 5 or lower, yet the average may be grade 1, 2 or 3, so the farmers in my area