

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the targets which were agreed upon can still be met by the United States. They will need more treatment facilities. We are taking a two pronged approach, reducing phosphates in detergents and adding treatment facilities.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

STATUS OF BILL C-187—ANNOUNCEMENT OF ALLOTTED DAY ON THURSDAY

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): A point of order, Mr. Speaker, concerning the business of the House. In view of the announcement which was made by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in Whitehorse last Friday concerning Bill C-187, is it the intention of the government to proceed now with Bill C-187 either in committee or in this House? If it is not the intention to do so, as the minister said in Whitehorse, can a statement now be made accordingly so as to remove the uncertainty affecting mining capital going into the Yukon?

Mr. Speaker: I am not prepared to recognize that that is a point of order. At the same time, I am prepared to allow the minister to reply to the question.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): I should like to clarify the situation and will do so as soon as I have a moment in which to discuss the matter with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

I had intended to ask for the floor myself on a point of order, but merely to confirm what I think has been conveyed informally, namely, that in view of the large number of allotted days facing us in this part of the session I should like to call an allotted day for Thursday, and I so give notice for the benefit of the table officers.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PRAIRIE GRAIN STABILIZATION ACT

PROVISION FOR PAYMENTS TO WESTERN CANADA PRODUCERS IN YEARS WHEN RECEIPTS BELOW FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE

The House resumed, from Tuesday, June 22, consideration of Bill C-244, respecting the stabilization of prairie grain sale proceeds and to repeal or amend certain related statutes, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and motions Nos. 1 and 2 of Mr. Gleave (page 7252).

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, on June 22 last the Liberal government had the audacity to bring forward for debate Bill C-244, expecting it to pass through the House with all its amendments before the Saskatchewan election took place the following day. The amendments we have introduced, Nos. 1 and 2, are concerned with the costs of production. If the bill had gone through

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

without amendment on June 22, no doubt the minister would have been pleased, but the farmers of western Canada would have known full well that they had been seduced by the government.

The amendments were not accepted at that time and the minister failed to learn a lesson from his experience in the House. He went ahead. He sent out promissory notes to the producers of western Canada telling them what they would be getting and when they could expect it. There can be no question that the amendments we have introduced in connection with costs of production deal with the most important aspect of this legislation with which Parliament should concern itself. It is not a question of trying to brainwash the people of western Canada with stories about what they are to get and when they can expect it.

Back in June, when this bill was last debated, reference was made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) to the cost of farm machinery—a direct cost to producers. In the short time I had the floor, I pointed out to the Minister of Agriculture that he had done nothing for two years about the cost of farm machinery even though Dr. Barber had recommended that an investigation should be carried out under the terms of the Combines Investigation Act. The minister said; "Stick to the facts. That is not true."

I wish to point out to members on the government side, and particularly to the minister, that as long ago as October 14, 1970, questions on this subject were asked during the question period. A late night debate took place on this very question of whether the government was prepared to take action under the combines legislation with regard to the price of farm machinery. We talked to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) on numerous occasions, and the only acknowledgement we received was to the effect that the government was looking into the question and would see what could be done.

One of the questions on this subject was asked as long ago as October 14, 1970. On May 21, 1971, questions were still being asked about it. There were debates late at night about what was to be done so far as the Department of Consumer Affairs was concerned. The only information we received was that the matter was being looked after. All this shows that little is being done in an attempt to reduce cost to the producers of western Canada, yet this is an area of the greatest significance and it is what amendment No. 1 is all about. The minister should cease trying to tell the farmers of western Canada that a stabilization plan based on gross income instead of net income is in order.

The other night a great debate took place in the House on the subject of the stabilization plan as it relates to the situation under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. Members of the House heard how the laws of the land can be broken by taking shortcuts. At that time the minister was criticizing some of my hon. friends. He said the bill had been held up particularly by members of the NDP—not those from Saskatchewan who were busy campaigning but by several from other parts of the country who had remained here to block the bill. Mr. Speaker, at that time, on June 22, two New Democrats from Saskatchewan spoke on this particular bill. Again, this shows the inconsistency of hon. gentlemen opposite. The half-truths we