

*Prairie Grain Stabilization Act*

that if the motion of the minister responsible for the Wheat Board is in order, it is not debatable.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, in a technical way I suppose it might be argued that since unanimous consent has been given, anything goes from now on. But I think it should be clear and it should be known that when there were discussions about having this debate on Tuesday night, and those discussions took place last Friday and again yesterday, they referred only to two hours of debate on Tuesday night.

**Mr. Horner:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The Chair would like to make a ruling on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The Chair permitted the hon. member some latitude in speaking again, which perhaps should not have been allowed. I thought he might wish to elaborate on the original point of order. I am prepared to make my ruling. On the other hand, if the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) wishes to clarify the matter, I will hear him.

**Mr. Horner:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre raised the point of order regarding whether, in view of the fact that we are now proceeding on the basis of unanimous consent, the motion of the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board can be put to the House and is in order. I thank him for his suggestions and I thank the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) for his remarks. It seems to me, however, that once unanimous consent has been given everything must flow from that. Consent was not given conditionally; there were no qualifications to it, as I understand.

It therefore seems to me that the business of the House has proceeded or flowed from that unanimous consent. The unanimous consent secured the necessary time and therefore the Standing Orders do in fact apply to the proceedings that we are now engaged in as a result of that unanimous agreement. I therefore think that the motion is properly before the House.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Hon. members are familiar with the provision of Standing Order 6 (5). Because this is not a matter that hon. members deal with very often, the motion having been put I will read Standing Order 6 (5) (b):

When Mr. Speaker puts the question on such motion, he shall ask those members who object to rise in their places. If ten or more members then rise, the motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn, otherwise, the motion shall have been adopted.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

*And more than ten members having risen:*

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The motion is deemed to have been withdrawn.

**Some hon. Members:** Poor farmers!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question on motion No. 1? The hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey).

**Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River):** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the minister had to resort to the method he just used to try to limit debate on this subject when many members were not expecting it. When you look at the intent and the very wording of the bill, you see that it is a stabilization plan. It talks of stabilizing agriculture, the income from which has been at a disastrously low level over the past few years. When an hon. member used the term "stabilizing poverty" earlier in the debate, he was in truth very accurate.

Motion No. 1 gets at the nitty-gritty of the problem. It is probably the most important of the 16 amendments before us. The fact that there may be built into the stabilization program an escalation clause such as there is for industry, labour and many other areas of the economy that will allow incomes to increase as production costs increase, is one of the most pressing necessities that is facing agriculture today. The fact that this has not been the case has led to the situation where the costs of agricultural production have risen astronomically. In the past 20 years they have doubled, redoubled, doubled and redoubled again, yet the price to the producer remains the same. This is like going to labour in our industrial plants and saying that we will see that their income rises but they will have to work faster and faster and faster. This is what the agricultural segment of our economy has been asked to do. It has been asked to work harder, scheme more and invest more capital and not to ask for any more for their product because that is unreasonable.

A few moments ago the minister commented on remarks made by hon. members. Referring to the first amendments, he said it would make the stabilization fund totally unworkable. This reminds me of the situation that existed when the marketing bill, C-176, was being considered. Many members of the committee agreed with quality controls but they seemed useless in light of the fact that the same board was not allowed to impose import controls. This was one of our major problems. Amendments were moved and suggestions made that we give the marketing board power to impose import controls. A similar amendment was drafted with regard to the textiles bill, but it was rejected. It was said that it was out of order and unworkable. This shows the double standard of this government. There is a double standard when agriculture is placed alongside many other segments of our economy.

It is interesting to note the tenor of the mail which members have received. The \$100 million payment the minister was going to use to blackmail people to accept his stabilized poverty program has not been going too well.

**An hon. Member:** The bribe.