

Canagrex

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I rise to point out that it is not a point of order. The Minister is simply being argumentative. On every agricultural bill of any consequence to Canada, or to western Canada in particular, the Minister is trying to curtail debate because he is afraid of the issues. That is why he rises.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The point raised initially by the Hon. Minister is not a point of order. Members may interpret or give other names to particular items in the rules as they wish, but that is not for the Chair to interfere with at this time.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture indicates he wishes to rise on another point of order.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) has made the comment that in every instance when there is legislation before the House I try to curtail debate. That is far, far from the truth and he knows it.

Mr. Huntington: What did you do on the Crow?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: After eight hours of debate you put closure on it.

Mr. Whelan: The Mother of Parliament does the same thing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The matter raised by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is debate and not a point of order.

I recognize the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council on another point of order.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I simply rise to set the record straight. On page 30 of the new Standing Orders, the Standing Orders themselves identify Standing Order 37 as closure. We are not operating under that rule. The Minister of Agriculture is correct that this is time allocation and not closure, which is clearly identified as Rule 37 in the Standing Orders.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. I presume time is of the essence. The Chair certainly does not intend to interfere with the names that Hon. Members want to give to a particular point in our rules, procedures or precedents. If an Hon. Member wants to call my mother-in-law by any other name, that is the Hon. Member's privilege. I would invite Hon. Members to continue with the debate. However, the Hon. Member for Capilano did rise on a point of order.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, with respect to that scurrilous non-point of order raised by the Minister of Agriculture, I would draw to the Chair's attention that four minutes of the time allotted to the Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) has been used and I suggest that that time be added to his ten-minute speech.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The point raised by the Hon. Member for Capilano is well taken, and the Chair will exercise its usual discretion. The Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin.

Mr. Schellenberger: Mr. Speaker, I did not realize the Minister would get so exercised when I rose to speak, but any time a motion is moved in the House that curtails my right to speak on every one of these substantial amendments that were made to the Bill, I call it closure on debate. Time allocation is just a nice way of putting it. It is in fact closure.

As Members on this side have already pointed out, when the Minister becomes disturbed about the various aspects of this Bill he is very quick to rise in an attempt to defend the indefensible. Let us review the last ten months with respect to closure motions. The only two times that the Minister has risen in the House to enter into the debate was to move closure—once on Canagrex and once on the Crow rate. Both those measures have a substantial effect in western Canada where the Government has no Members.

Why is he doing this? He knows very well that he cannot stand the heat of debate on both of those issues in western Canada. Therefore his solution is to close the debate before Members in the House have the right to put forward their debate or before the various commodity and other groups in the western Provinces, including the Premiers and their Cabinets, have a chance to speak on this legislation.

Let us see what the Minister has done since 1972. The Minister has only taken one new initiative in the House of Commons. That is the meat import law. Every other time he has risen in the House it has been to amend good legislation which has been brought forward by other Governments. When he did rise on two new issues in the last ten months, the purpose on both occasions was to move a motion of time allocation.

At a time when there are tens of hundreds of farms in this country going out of business, we are debating in the House two Bills that will not assist them in any way. This Bill in particular will not assist them in any way to become more viable in the country. Powers in this Bill already exist in other legislation which could provide the same type of opportunities for agriculture in this country. They exist in IT&C, the Commercial Trading Corporation and the foreign service.

If this Bill is passed, will the private trading corporations in this country have the same opportunities to carry out the good work that they have been doing in the past on behalf of farmers? Will the marketing boards in this country, whether or not they are supply management, have the same opportunity to provide these types of trading services for farmers that they have in the past? The answer obviously has to be no.

The Minister was pressed in committee to answer why he wishes to have the powers that are contained in Clause 14. Today we are debating Motions 6, 7, 8 and 9 which I put on the Order Paper and which will remove the powers to buy and sell from this corporation. At least 50 organizations mainly from western Canada have disapproved of Clause 14 and have stated so on the record in committee. Many other national corporations have said the same thing. They have asked the