

*Canadian Wheat Board Act*

but it should be possible to find out. Now the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) tells us, "Oh well, the fortuitous profits made by those companies are being returned to the farmers." I do not know what fortuitous profits are, or how you separate them from ordinary profits. They are all profits anyway. I can guarantee that the grain companies are not handling these grains at cost, which is what would have been done if they had been under the wheat board.

The position of this group is quite clear. We believe in orderly marketing, and we believe this requires that people should deliver their grain to the government agency. It is a non-profit agency, and the principle behind it is good and right.

Not very many minutes ago the Minister of Trade and Commerce interjected that we had to get this thing through as quickly as possible. I agree; I think that is necessary. We want to get these payments out to the farmers as quickly as possible. In order to facilitate this legislation—because apparently that is what the government considers necessary before it can make any of these payments—we are going to move that this resolution be divided into two parts; that the non-controversial part be placed before this house, go to committee, and pass through as rapidly as possible. We will facilitate that. The other part, which is controversial, we believe should be sent to the proper committee, where it can be considered. Then it can be brought back here and a decision reached, as the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) said, by hon. members standing up and being counted, to show whether or not we stand for the principle of orderly marketing. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member—

Mr. GARDINER: If I may interrupt the hon. member, I understand that he is proposing to move an amendment to the resolution which, as he says, would separate one question from the other. As I said the other night, that would mean four discussions in the house, two on the resolutions and two on second readings of the two bills. The opportunity to do at the proper time what is being suggested is provided at all times under the procedure in this house. The resolution itself can be passed and the legislation brought before the house. That legislation has to be given second reading, which provides an opportunity again to discuss the whole principle. Then it goes to committee, where the different clauses can be discussed. If at that time, when we reach that position, the house indicates that these two matters should be separated, there will be an opportunity to do so. But to do it at this stage would simply slow down the

[Mr. Castleden.]

whole discussion on these matters so that we would take just twice as long to get them through the house.

As has been said by other hon. members, we are agreed on that part of it which provides payments to farmers, and this might be put through in a hurry. There is a reason why the other part should not be unduly delayed. Everyone admits that more than this legislation will be required to put oats and barley under the wheat board. That point is not a matter for discussion either inside or outside this house. There is no question about that among farm organizations, wheat pools or anyone else. It is agreed by everyone that, in addition to the legislation passed here, legislation must be passed by the legislatures before feed grains can be put under the wheat board. Those legislative bodies are now meeting; and the argument is that if we go ahead and refer this matter to the agriculture committee, if we discuss it back and forth here, and put ourselves in the position that we shall not pass it before Easter, there is no possibility at all of having coarse grains brought under the wheat board this coming year. So I would suggest that this resolution be allowed to reach the committee stage on the bill where at least we have the legislation before us and we can discuss the legislation rather than all these other matters we are talking about tonight.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: To some extent I agree with the minister, but I do not agree that there would be twice as much discussion if we divided this into two parts. There will be almost unanimous agreement on the first part of the resolution. It could be put through tonight; the resolution could go through the house and committee stages and the legislation brought down. The other part may be more controversial. The minister says the other provinces will have to pass complementary legislation; that is, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I would point out that the government of Saskatchewan have already expressed their willingness to pass this legislation immediately. All they asked the government to do was send them some legislation which would meet the situation and, if necessary, they would have legal counsel here within forty-eight hours. Those provincial legislatures are now in session. If they are told that complementary legislation is necessary it can be brought down while their houses are still sitting. We do not want this delayed. As I said a few moments ago, we want to help the minister as much as possible, and we are trying to facilitate this legislation. However, we do see the possibility