

ed". It does not authorize spending not permitted in other sections of the proposed Act and merely serves to place a limitation or condition on spending if payments are made other than to the railroads. For those reasons, Madam Speaker, I would ask you to find that Motion No. 155 is in order and that the House should be permitted to consider that motion.

● (1750)

You will be delighted to learn, Madam Speaker, that I am about to reach the end of this submission. However, I would like to make a request with respect to the grouping of motions for debate. You asked us to make those suggestions. The motions which I have touched upon in my submission, along with many of the motions which you have previously indicated are in order, seem to relate to two broad subject matters. I believe that debate on these motions would be more comprehensible, more orderly, and would progress more easily if they were to be grouped for debate as they relate to these two subjects. Therefore, I propose that Motions Nos. 153 and 155, if they are now ruled in order, be grouped for debate with Motions Nos. 154 and 48, as all of these motions relate to the method of payment proposed in the Bill. As well, I would ask that Motions Nos. 59, 64, 86, 129 and 145, if they are now ruled in order, be grouped for debate with Motions Nos. 63, 68, 69, 99, 102, 115, 127, 130, 131, 133, 136, 138, 140, 143 and 148, as all of these motions relate to the rate structure proposed in the Bill.

I would be pleased to provide you with a written breakdown of these proposed groupings if that would be of assistance to you, Madam Speaker. I am sure I can get these notes back from *Hansard* in time to do so.

I thank the Chair and the House for their indulgence in listening to a rather lengthy argument. I am sure, Madam Speaker, you will agree it was necessary. Certainly, in my experience, it is the first time I have ever seen 174 amendments to a Bill come before the House. Only 46 of these were motions made by this Party, of which 71.7 per cent have been ruled to be in order. Some 109 motions have been moved by the New Democratic Party, of which 38.5 per cent appear to be in order. By the Government there have been 19 amendments moved, of which 78.9 per cent appear to be in order.

By virtue of the very bulk and number of amendments, the argument and submissions have been necessarily of some length. I hope that those submissions commend themselves to the Chair and that perhaps a measure of substance will be found so as to permit the motions which I have addressed to be put to the House. With respect to the motions I have not addressed, I do not intend to do so, because obviously I agree with the concern of the Chair with respect thereto.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the submissions of the Hon. House Leader for the Official Opposition (Mr. Nielsen). He obviously has done a first rate job in analyzing the amendments.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Adjournment Debate

Mr. Deans: No, I will not go too far. Do not worry. I agree in part with what he said. I wonder, however, if for ease of handling, it might be possible to call it six o'clock in order to put my comments in one block in one day's *Hansard* so that it can be considered by the Speaker in that way, rather than start now and then start over tomorrow.

Madam Speaker: Is it agreed that we call it six o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

GRAIN—WESTERN GRAIN STABILIZATION PROGRAM. (B) FIVE-YEAR AVERAGING PRINCIPLE

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take the opportunity to speak with respect to a question I raised just yesterday regarding the western grain stabilization plan. In response to my question, Mr. Speaker, the Minister said in part, as reported at page 27764 of *Hansard*:

I think it is a matter that would have to be more carefully assessed than one is given time to do during Question Period.

I again raise the question of the grain stabilization plan now simply because I believe at this moment in our history we need a response which is more extensive than a person can give during the Question Period.

The concern on the Prairies with regard to the western grain stabilization plan is extensive. We are hearing more and more about farmers who are becoming suspicious, who believe that their money is being taken for general Government revenues, who believe that political motives are being tied to the payout and who believe that somehow there is some scam which is operating. I do not necessarily associate or dissociate myself with those sentiments. I simply say I believe there is justifiable reason for farmers to be concerned.

The legislation was written in 1976, Sir, and it was based on the immediate previous history of the stable farm economic conditions of the 1960s. In the late 1970s and 1980s a much more tumultuous economic period demonstrated, with high interest rates and a high inflation rate, that the western grain stabilization plan was not sensitive to individual farmers' needs. The result was that once the plan was initiated in 1976, in the next two years, 1978 and 1979, there were payouts. The fact is, however, that at the present time we are having our most severe agricultural cost-price squeeze. Yet there has not been a payout, Sir, since 1978.