

Canagrex

Government needs those powers is absolutely folly. Furthermore, to stand in the House and to say, "But we will not use those powers", is not possible. I say to the House of Commons, there is no such thing in the world of politics as granting power and then not using it. If the power is granted, sooner or later the power will be used. That ought to be very serious indeed.

It is important that we underscore why the debate is in the House at this time. It is because the Liberals are where they are in the Gallup polls today. There is a pattern amongst the Liberals in the country—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member, but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There does not appear to be unanimous consent.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I am just on page one.

Mr. Blaikie: We gave consent, Arnold. We wanted more.

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Bill C-85, an Act to Establish a Corporation called Canagrex, to promote, facilitate and engage in the export of agricultural and food products from Canada, is finally reaching the harvest stage. The Hon. Member asks who wrote it. I can tell him who wrote it. I did today, while I was sitting here, bored to death with the kind of speeches I heard from the opposite side. This is not the first time that I have stood in this House to speak on the subject of Canagrex. I raised it in the House two and one half years ago, to be exact. The Hon. Member who is asking who wrote it can check the proceedings as reported in *Hansard* on November 28, 1980, when this topic was raised by myself in the House of Commons. I spoke to it again on February 3, 1982 from the standpoint of promoting Canadian exports. I am pleased to take part in the debate on this Bill again today.

I was pleased that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) rose this morning on a point of order and clarified the difference between closure and time allocation. When does the Government use time allocation?

Mr. McKnight: Every time.

Mr. Flis: I think that when the Minister and the Government feel that there has been ample time to discuss the Bill in committee, ample time to debate a piece of legislation in the House, ample time to receive feedback from across the country and to hear witnesses before committee and, if the Bill is not going through its proper stages, then I think that the Government has no choice but to bring in time allocation. However, after 85 hours of debate in committee and in the House, I do not think anyone can complain that the Minister brought in time allocation.

In the British parliamentary system, when unconstructive and unproductive methods are being employed to hamper passage of important legislation before the House, time allocation is a correct and needed mechanism. That is why it was written into our Standing Orders. The British Parliament repeatedly uses it when all other avenues have been exhausted. This is the case with Canagrex.

I listened very carefully to the speeches this morning and this afternoon by the Hon. Members opposite. I was very interested by the comments made by the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington). I lost my respect for the Hon. Member a bit when I heard his comments—

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): He speaks from knowledge.

Mr. Flis:—in expressing his views this morning. He said that the Bill is nothing more than public mischief. He said that this is another Bill to "screw the West, and I quote him. There is no one more interested in Canadian unity than all the Hon. Members on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Malone: That's the joke of the year.

Mr. Flis: I think that with the Tories lowering themselves to that kind of debate, I am pleased that the Government did bring in time allocation.

Mr. Malone: Come West and say that.

Mr. Flis: Then the Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) called this a communist plot. He looked and pointed at me and said, "The Members from eastern Europe should know better". I would like to draw to the Hon. Member's attention that I am not from eastern Europe.

Mr. Taylor: Who said you were?

Mr. Flis: I am a Canadian, born and raised in Saskatchewan. I am a western Canadian, not an eastern European, but—

Mr. Taylor: You sure don't show it, the way you vote.

Mr. Flis: This, again, is the stereotyping of Canadians by Conservatives, "One is this, one is this and one is this", instead of considering us as being Canadians and parliamentarians in the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Flis: I was also very interested in the words spoken by the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart) when he referred to the Bill and said, "Another definite move toward state control".

Mr. Taylor: Right on.

Mr. Flis: The Hon. Member for Bow River says, "Right on". I would like to ask the Hon. Member and his Party