

Adjournment Motion

He said: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion it is a matter of deleting, in clause 5(2), lines 10 to 18. The deletion is simply this:

The said Act is further amended by adding thereto, immediately after subsection 10(1) thereof, the following subsection:

"(1.1) For the purpose of stabilizing the price of an agricultural commodity, the Board may exercise such other powers as are prescribed by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Board, for that purpose."

In dealing with this motion, one of the main problems is that nowhere in the bill is there an explanation of what is constituted by the word "Board" that is in line 3 of (1.1). Certainly we would want an explanation of that to really understand what the minister is trying to get at with this stabilization bill. It would seem to me that we have to be very careful in the legislation we are passing, because of the fact that we have seen in time past the political manoeuvring which does take place, primarily before elections.

Going back a certain period of time to the last time there was a hog stabilization payment made, there was a stabilization payment made to the farmer and at the time it only required a dollar and some cents, I believe, for each hog affected by the legislation, but because of the fact it was just prior to an election—at least we have to assume this—the then minister of agriculture decided that it would be advisable to pay \$5 per hog on 200 hogs, which meant that those people producing the maximum number of hogs could receive up to \$1,000. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) wants to establish a sound basis upon which these payments will be made and it will not just be at the whim of the minister of agriculture of the day or the governor in council.

We have to take a serious look at the legislation as it is being debated in this House to ensure that it will stabilize the agricultural industry in Canada. We have to realize that we are in competition with our neighbour to the south, and the fact that it is using its agricultural production to a large degree to counteract its deficiency in energy production will create a difficult period in our agriculture industry in the months and years which lie ahead.

Certainly we do not want the agricultural industry to have to rely on an election in order for it to obtain the proper income for its products. In view of that, we have to have the legislation tied down to a form which will not only be acceptable to the industry but also satisfactory to the consumer and ensure that there will be an adequate supply of whatever product we are dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight are as follows: the hon.

[Mr. Towers.]

member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Immigration—Need for farm workers in Nova Scotia—Government action; the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard)—Health—Medicare—Alleged setting of time limits for medical examinations—Government position; the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds)—Labour Conditions—Possibility of meeting Mr. Fitzsimmons, president of Teamsters Union—Government position.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills and notices of motions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I think there would be agreement to take order No. 36 standing in the name of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), and the government would request that all other items stand.

● (1700)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Order, please. Items Nos. 8, 34, 4, 10, 24 and 33 are requested to be stood by the government. Is it agreed?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Do they retain their order?

Mr. Reid: Yes.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

PROVISION TO INCLUDE PERIOD ONE RECEIVES WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION AS PART OF QUALIFYING PERIOD FOR BENEFITS

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt) moved that Bill C-236 to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when the present Unemployment Insurance Act was proclaimed on June 23, 1971, it included several aspects which were commendable. It included, for example, a maternity benefit clause, a sickness benefit clause and a clause covering the period of qualification for contributions before one could collect unemployment insurance of at least eight weeks in the previous 52-week period.

The new act also eliminated some things that were commendable and some that were beneficial and useful to the working people of this country. That is what my bill, C-236, is trying to amend. One of the things the new act eliminated was provision for workers who were injured or became sick on the job and as a result received workmen's