

two amendments that are not directly related to each other. Speaking on the second motion, what we are interested in—as has been indicated, the motion may not produce this result—is maintaining 100 per cent of the average and not 90 per cent. We do not want the leeway that 90 per cent of the average would allow. We are interested in establishing and maintaining 100 per cent of the average, and that should apply in all instances where there is a reduction in income and benefit should be paid. The hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) pointed out—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I must do so to advise him that his time has expired.

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member may proceed if there is unanimous consent. Is there such consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Peters:** I will not speak any more on this subject, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure we should all have been glad to hear the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) complete his remarks. We know how much of his speech was left because we have heard it about three times already in committee. Most of the motions on the order paper, including the ones we are now dealing with, were fully dealt with and disposed of in committee. They are back at the report stage before the House.

The first motion, dealing with the deduction of increased costs of production would, as was clearly indicated in committee, make the stabilization fund completely unworkable. I hope that is not what hon. members had in mind in putting it forward. The stabilization found could represent in the future an extremely important form of income assistance to the prairie farmer. Accordingly, I urge hon. members to support the bill and make sure that it gains swift passage, and not to support amendments such as this which would be impossible to apply because there is no possibility of an accurate determination.

The second motion would be a departure from the basic principle involved in the stabilization plan. The plan relates to 90 per cent of grain production, not because it is 90 per cent of every farmer's production but, rather, because by excluding the production of very large farmers above a certain limit the amount of grain left within the plan would be 90 per cent and that is consistent with our position. It is a motion which I would urge hon. members to oppose.

It is important that we move forward with this extremely important legislation. I think we started this evening in a co-operative spirit. In order that we may make further progress, I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney):

That this sitting continue beyond ten o'clock for the purpose of completing the report stage of Bill C-244, or until 12 o'clock.

*Prairie Grain Stabilization Act*

**Mr. Peters:** That is not what we consented to.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since we gave unanimous consent for this matter to be dealt with tonight, whereas by the rules it would not be possible to deal with it until tomorrow, I ask whether it is in order, under such conditions, for the minister to move this kind of motion.

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I think clearly, that it is in order under the rules since we are proceeding with our regular business. If we are to go back into the history of unanimous consent we ought to remember that on Friday of last week a procedural technicality under which the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) refused to allow us to proceed caused the difficulty in the first place. I think it is clear that the motion may be moved. There is nothing in the rules limiting the right to move such a motion when the business of the House is being considered.

**Mr. Horner:** Mr. Speaker, on this point may I ask for clarification and an interpretation of what the minister requires. If we finish the report stage, will votes be called on the 16 motions before the House? Would they be called tonight? I ask this question because a number of hon. members are not present; they were not aware that the matter would be dealt with by voting tonight, because votes are normally deferred to a later date. Could the minister say how the votes will be handled on these motions, or will they be deferred to a later date?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Before the minister responds I suggest to the House that the Chair should decide the point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). If it is not in order to proceed with the motion moved by the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, then of course further discussion would not be necessary.

The Chair understands the point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and has listened to the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. If other hon. members want to assist the Chair to determine the regularity of the minister's moving the motion, in view of the fact that the House is now dealing with the bill on the basis of unanimous consent, the Chair will hear hon. members. Otherwise the Chair is prepared to rule on the point.

**An hon. Member:** Make your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, without question the minister has the right to bring forward the motion. Speaking strictly from a procedural point of view, may I say that the House gave unanimous consent to proceeding with this matter tonight, with no qualifications. I appeal to hon. members to support the minister responsible for the Wheat Board in this respect.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The Chair invited only comments on the point of order. The minister knows