

Supply

I think our laws are wonderful. I would be surprised if people in the parts of southern Alberta that I know who have any size of holding at all, do not retire with some form of dignity, more dignity than would have been possible even ten years ago, from the return received for their farms. In that time farm values have increased by three of four hundred per cent. That means they have so much more money now although, of course, there will be capital gains tax to pay. As far as I am concerned, we have not finished with that yet. We have said that the valuation date should be 1974, but we can still have discussions on that. The matter is not finished as far as I and many other members of caucus are concerned.

Why is farm land selling at such high prices, Mr. Chairman? The real answer is because agricultural economics are good in Canada. Farmers are buying land because they want to farm it and because it is a good investment. We have one of the best systems in the world. We hear talk about large holdings, but it is still farm families who are buying the land. Two or three members of a family often combine to buy a quarter, half, or a whole section of land in their neighbourhood. We hear a lot about foreign ownership, but over 95 per cent of farms in Canada are owned and operated by families. Not many countries in the world can make that claim. That is one reason why our farms are so productive.

There has been much talk about a Canadian cheap food policy. Mr. Chairman, there are many farmers who never apply to me for any assistance whatsoever. They do not get a penny of our tax dollars; they get all their money from the marketplace. I am referring to some of the people on marketing boards, my prize projects. Those people are paying their bills and taxes, they are making investments and are not receiving a penny of subsidy.

That is one of the reasons why I do not need so much money in my budget. I do not have to give out tremendous subsidies such as those given to the pork producers this year which will amount to \$46 million.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order which I have discussed with you and the appropriate persons in the government and the official opposition.

In accordance with the practice that has been employed three or four times in the last few days, each time the New Democratic Party is accorded 20 minutes we would like to split it into two ten-minute periods on the understanding that, if the first member goes over time, the second one is called at the end of a total of 20 minutes. I believe this is acceptable and, of course, we would agree to it if the other parties would like to do the same thing. In the next 20-minute period we would like to present the hon. member for Prince Albert, followed by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Collenette: Mr. Chairman, I understand from my colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, that this would apply to all parties. Is that agreeable?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Collenette: The 20-minute period accorded to each party in a normal rotation can be split into two ten-minute speeches by each party if they wish. Is that the agreement?

Mr. Wise: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is correct. There has been consultation with us and we certainly agreed. We may not choose to divide our 20 minutes into two ten-minute speeches until, perhaps, eight o'clock. If it is the wish of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and New Democratic members to divide their 20 minutes beginning now, that certainly meets with our approval.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order. Hon. members opposite make all kinds of accusations and put questions and I have no opportunity to answer. How am I supposed to answer that kind of discussion unless you leave me about an hour at the end of the session to answer a hundred questions? There must be about 40 already that have not been answered.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ostiguy: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

Mr. Ostiguy: Mr. Chairman, when the Leader of the New Democratic Party asked me whether it was possible, I said yes as far as the NDP members were concerned, but government members still want 20 minutes to make their statement and an opportunity for the minister to reply.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The matter now falls into two areas, the first being that proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre who proposed that each party internally regulate itself to distribute the 20 minutes amongst its members as it sees fit. That is rather different from what we earlier had in mind in the last couple of days, where the time period was distributed evenly in two periods of ten minutes each. I know that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made it clear that it is a 20-minute time-frame and it is not going to be the responsibility of the Chair to see to it that it is divided within that time.

In that case, as the hon. member suggested, when the first member of a given party sits down and his time period has not been entirely used, if the House now agrees—and I shall come to that in a moment—the Chair will then recognize the next member of that party until the 20 minutes have been used up.

I can see some difficult problems arising. We may get to the point where some hon. members suggest that two minutes remain, or one minute remains, and we will be going around at a fair clip. But if that is the proposal that the hon. member wants to put and if hon. members are satisfied with it, that is fine.

Before I put it to the House, however, there is the matter raised by the Minister of Agriculture. It requires unanimous