

Adjournment Debate

us made an agreement and the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie was not even there, and he does not even know what he is talking about. It is always the same thing in this kind of debate. You should call him to order, Mr. Speaker, and instruct him to talk about the matter before us, namely agriculture, instead of letting him talk about things in which he was not involved.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue the debate but it is no use; the population—

Mr. Champagne (Champlain): You have understood—

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, to answer this point of order—

Before long the population will decide the Hon. Member's fate; just look at what happens in the polls—

Mr. Speaker, the gist of the matter is to know who is concerned and what sector of our population is affected, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is the problem of farmers in Canada, and we know how important it is, even for people from an urban area—

An Hon. Member: From downtown Montreal—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead (Mr. Gérin) on a point of order.

Mr. Gérin: Mr. Speaker, about the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart), I wish to point out that he has already taken part in this debate and has absolutely no right to speak again. The only thing he wants is for the debate to last till six o'clock, which will happen in less than a minute, to prevent the motion from coming to a vote, and he is therefore wasting the time of the House.

I ask the Hon. Member to remain seated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) on debate.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, as we conclude, could you explain to the Hon. Member, who is naive and stupid, that the Bill will not be talked out today and will remain on the Order Paper. I shall close on this note, Mr. Speaker, as it is now six o'clock and time for the House to adjourn.

• (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

AGRICULTURE—PRODUCTION OF ETHANOL FROM GRAIN. (B) POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE MARKET FOR GRAIN

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, it will come as no surprise to Members of the House that I am rising today to express my dissatisfaction with the reply given to me on May 12 by the Minister of State for the Canadian Wheat Board (Mr. Mayer), in reply to a serious question that I thought was well put, regarding alternative markets for farm production. It is a subject very much linked to the Private Members' debate we just heard. The Minister could only reply that enzymes were being improved. He also made a rather ludicrous suggestion that the Province of Manitoba, the leader in fuel alcohol use and development in Canada, should be doing more. The Hon. Minister should know that his own province is doing more than any other.

The answer given by the Minister was out of touch with the present political and market realities. He ignored the desperate need for additional markets and the fact that emergency aid is something that can only use part of Canada's grain surplus and should not be seen as a marketing tool. He was so out of touch with reality as almost to recall the words of the former Prime Minister: "Why should I sell your wheat?" In the meantime, politicians south of the border are considering a five-fold expansion of an existing two-billion-litre-a-year fuel ethanol industry, with the support of the Vice-President, who is a candidate for the presidency.

The Government does not seem to understand what the debate is about. Lead removal has taken lead from gasoline in the United States, Europe, and Canada, and has created a market for octane enhancement that is one-tenth of the size of the total gasoline market. There is a significant difference for exporting nations like Canada. The difference is so important that international acceptance of fuel ethanol should be a major element of our grain marketing policy. Yet, there seems to be nothing more than a general understanding of the scope and impact of this industry.

In February, the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board held a press conference before going to San Diego for a meeting of the world's five largest grain exporters. He told journalists at that time: "We spend a tremendous amount of money in all our agricultural programs, almost exclusively in economic terms on the supply side and we need to be looking more on the demand side". Indeed, the Minister is absolutely right. However, he is failing to follow up those words with any form of concrete commitment.

Three weeks after the Minister made that statement, Vice-President Bush said:

I propose we consider a policy that will immediately increase demand. The answer is ethanol, the fuel distilled from corn and other crops . . . I share the goal of the National Corn Growers, that by 1990 we can produce 2.5 billion gallons of ethanol from 1 billion bushels of corn. It will help our farmers and manufacturers, while contributing to cleaner air and energy independence.

That 2.5 billion American gallons represents some 7.5 billion litres of ethanol from 1 billion bushels of corn. Those