

"Bill C-690, an Act to amend the Combines Investigation Act (sports franchises), be not now read a second time but that the Order be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs."

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** It has been moved by Mr. Speyer, seconded by Mr. Kilgour:

That Bill C-690, an Act to amend the Combines Investigation Act (sports franchises) be not now read a second time but that the Order be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said amendment?

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** I just want to say that I agree.

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion, as amended?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Accordingly, the Order is discharged, the Bill is withdrawn and the subject matter thereof is referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to know exactly what it is we are agreeing to. If the purpose of the amendment would be to change the Bill and therefore to refer its subject matter to committee without ending the present debate, perhaps it is something to which we could agree. The question is whether the debate is ended on the motion being proposed.

• (1730)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** I should make it very clear to the House that the motion moved by the Hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Speyer) was agreed to. That motion had the effect of having the Bill not now read a second time, but that the Order read earlier be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. The House agreed to that motion. Therefore, there is nothing before the House at this time. The Order was discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

We will now proceed with the next item of Private Members' Business.

### *Agricultural Subsidies*

## **PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS**

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Shall all items listed under Private Members' Notices of Motions (Papers) preceding item No. 113 be allowed to stand by unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

### AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDIES

**Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East)** moved:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all studies, documents, research papers and reports done by or for any department or agency comparing Canadian government agricultural subsidies and United States government agricultural subsidies.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when I placed my question on the Order Paper on July 23, 1982, I wanted to know what research the Government might have undertaken to compare the subsidies Canadian farmers receive and the subsidies that farmers in countries such as the United States receive. I was interested because at that time the Government had already made plain that it was going to change the historic Crownsnest Pass Agreement.

Such changes will directly affect a large number of my constituents who are engaged in grain farming. The increase in the freight rates will diminish their ability to compete against grain growers in other countries, particularly their chief competitor, the United States grain grower.

Many Government members and other proponents for this change in the Crow have argued that it is an unfair subsidy to our grain farmers, that our grain farmers should pay a much higher rate for moving their grain and that the subsidies they supposedly are receiving under the Crow gives them an unfair advantage. Therefore, I wanted to know how direct or indirect subsidies which the Canadian farmers receive compare to those received by their major competitor, the U.S. grain farmer.

To say that I was shocked when I received the response from the Government earlier this year is putting it mildly. The response was: "The Minister of Agriculture is not aware of the existence of the documents requested. I therefore ask the Hon. Member to withdraw his motion". In other words, the Government does not have any studies, documents, research papers or reports on agricultural subsidies. Agriculture is one of Canada's major industries. It is one of our major export items. We are in direct competition with the United States, the European Common Market, Australia and Argentina, all of which give various subsidies and various forms of support.

Through Bill C-155, this Government will drastically change the economics of farming in western Canada yet this Government reports to the House that it has no studies, documents or reports on the subsidies that our wheat farmers receive compared to farmers in other countries. It has done no