

support of this bill, Hon. William Stewart, provincial Minister of Agriculture, said:

Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, I suggest that had the national marketing legislation now before the House of Commons been in effect, in my opinion the problems we now face across Canada would not have occurred, as far as interprovincial marketing problems are concerned.

Now as I understand it the national bill, Bill C-176, will be introduced for third reading in the House of Commons in the very near future. I am advised by the office of the Minister of Agriculture of Canada that the bill has passed the Standing Committee on Agriculture stage, has been returned to the House and will be proceeded with.

When it is passed it will provide the legislative authority at national level, but it must be complemented and supplemented by an exchange of power with the provinces. Here, Mr. Speaker, I wish to assert that I have assured the office of the federal Minister of Agriculture that we in Ontario will introduce the necessary amendments to our Farm Products Marketing Act to bring it in line with the national legislation, to provide for the reciprocal exchange of the necessary legislative powers.

That is the opinion of the Tory party of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, so they disagree with many members of the opposition in this House who have spoken on employment in agriculture. I have many things to say on the subject of regional economic expansion, but there is not time and I shall reserve my remarks on this subject for the budget debate.

There has been a great demand across this nation and in this House for an assessment of future policy on energy and national resources, although certain members obviously do not treat this as a very important subject. On May 26, the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works, through the government House leader submitted the following motion:

That the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works be authorized to study the oil and gas industry in Canada with particular reference to the ecological implications of various modes of transporting the product; and that in the conduct of such a study, the committee be empowered to adjourn from place to place within Canada during the week beginning June 13, 1971, and during the adjournment of the House.

At three o'clock that very afternoon, Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that we had agreement to go on with these oil and gas hearings and to continue them at a later date with organizations interested in the ecological effects this industry had on the environment. However, at a quarter to six I received word that there was opposition from the official opposition of the House of Commons. I might say—my statement will be backed up by the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange)—that on that afternoon we had a conversation with the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams).

● (8:10 p.m.)

**An hon. Member:** Shame!

**Mr. Hopkins:** At that time he said it would not be satisfactory to him because he was worried lest the young offenders bill came before the House that week.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It is my understanding that the hon. member's time has expired.

**Mr. Ricard:** He may continue, even if he is out of order.

### *Employment Programs*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The suggestion has been made that the hon. member should be allowed to continue because others have been granted extensions. That is entirely up to the House, but there should be unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** For two minutes.

**Mr. Ricard:** Even though the hon. member has been out of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard) suggests that even though the hon. member is out of order he should be allowed to continue.

**Mr. Hopkins:** I thank Your Honour and hon. members for accommodating me. As I was saying, the hon. member for Calgary North said, in the presence of the hon. member for Northwest Territories, that he did not want the hearings to go on that particular week lest the young offenders bill should come before the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I must say, on reflection, that the aside of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe was perhaps to the point. The hon. member should take into account that we have a motion before us. This is not a general debate on the budget. It is not a throne speech debate. Hon. members cannot roam all over the field and air, at this time, all their grievances in respect of hon. members on the other side of the House, the government or anyone else. If the hon. member is to be allowed to continue his remarks beyond the time allotted to him, he should adhere to the rules and limit his remarks to the matter before the House, namely, the motion of the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau).

I did not think the remarks of the hon. member would produce the result they did. I will now recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang)—

**Mr. Hopkins:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Hopkins:** Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that in my opinion the gas and oil pipeline industry and the natural resource industries are important employment factors. They are important to employment not only today but in the future. In that way I wanted to relate the matter to this debate. The question of employment is one not only of temporary but of long-term importance. It is a very serious question at this stage. It is a question in which all hon. members of the House are interested. It was in this light that I wanted to put my remarks on record. I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, if I did not make myself understood.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member does not have to apologize to me. I appreciate the point he was trying to make. I suggested that the hon. member could conclude his