

Canagrex

and food products and package, process, store, ship, insure, import, export, sell or otherwise dispose of products purchased by it. It is empowered to make grants and contributions for the purposes for which it was established and to purchase, lease or otherwise acquire and hold real personal property for actual use by Canagrex.

Those powers, Mr. Speaker, are awesome and dangerous when the House of Commons and the Auditor General do not even have the power to overview, audit or question professionally the people who comprise this subgovernment through the power that is distributed to friends and ideologues. That is what is at issue in this Bill. This is not the hour in Canada's history to be shoving this Bill down our throats under the force of closure!

• (1530)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: Canagrex, Mr. Speaker, can create a state monopoly for the export of agricultural products along the lines of such trading bureaucracies as exist in the socialist countries. My goodness, can we not learn from the experience of others who stifled and smothered initiative, the right to be free and the right to make a decision in the agricultural communities and the agricultural processing communities? When are we going to learn in this country? Why do we have to throw away that heritage and that freedom which we were given? That is what this Bill is doing, Mr. Speaker. What is happening with this avalanche of Crown corporations is the transferring of power out to ideologues and to "friends" and to people who are not answerable or accountable to the people of Canada. It is time we stopped it, and the time to stop it is with this Bill right now. Wait until we catch our breath. The Government does not need it right now. It is not going to add anything to this country. It is just going to damage us and create more regional antagonism and, of course, that is their very game.

[Translation]

Mr. Dionne (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Dionne), on a point of order.

Mr. Dionne (Chicoutimi): I would like to ask the Hon. Member how many times he attended the meetings of the Committee on Agriculture?

An Hon. Member: Never!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. Before asking a question, the Hon. Member must obtain the consent of the Hon. Member who just finished speaking.

Mr. Dionne (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, does the Hon. Member agree to my asking him a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): That requires the unanimous consent of the House, because the Hon. Member's time has expired.

[English]

Is there unanimous consent to allow the Parliamentary Secretary to ask a question?

Mr. Mayer: Not from a bunch of goofs like you guys, that is for sure.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I gather there is not unanimous consent.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. Order.

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills): Mr. Speaker, like other Hon. Members, I rise to speak on this Bill C-85, at the report stage, in a dispute which is totally unnecessary because, as you will know, Mr. Speaker, at second reading we said that this Bill has three provisions: the first one is to promote the export of agricultural production from this country, and on that heading we agreed totally; the second is the establishment of credit facilities in order to help companies financially to compete against other companies which were subsidizing the export of agricultural products, and with that heading we agreed completely. However, right from the start we have disagreed with the third part of this Bill because we know it is part of a broader scheme referred to by the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), with whom I agree 100 per cent, that is, the clauses wherein Canagrex can become the Petro-Canada of the food industry in that it has broad powers to buy and sell. That has been the basis of our opposition, Mr. Speaker, right from the start. The Government could have had the Canagrex Bill within one hour, a speech from each of the three Parties, if it had discarded that third clause, the buy and sell provision. The people of Canada have to know that. Certainly those in the agricultural industry do.

I am speaking to eight of the amendments and I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is obvious that the Government will prevail with the alliance between itself and the New Democratic Party, because the NDP is going to defeat these motions before us which will take away the buy and sell provisions. The New Democratic Party is once again going to sell out the West. It is going to vote with the Liberal Government as it did on the Constitution, because, of course, you have a New Democratic Party which does not want people to own land. That Party opposes the right to property. Why would Hon. Members of that Party now stand and argue for a clause—

Mr. Skelly: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. Order, please.