

*Non-Canadian Publications*

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are very anxious to deal with this bill as fully and as fairly as we can having regard to the important principle involved. I would respectfully suggest that government members who persist in interrupting members of the opposition when they are speaking are doing nothing to advance this. If government members are truly anxious to have this matter proceeded with they should sit quietly and allow opposition members to make their speeches, and extend to us the same courtesy we would extend them if they chose to speak on this bill.

**Mr. Blais:** Mr. Speaker, I must rise on this point of order. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) at about five minutes to ten tends to be very farcical. This bill has been subject to a filibuster since last Thursday. From the quality of the debate from the other side and the remarks made by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton it is evident that an attempt is being made by the opposition to delay passage of this bill and to prevent effect being given to the will of this House.

**An hon. Member:** What will?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. There was quite a bit of noise in the House and I think the hon. member who had the floor should be entitled to continue.

**Mr. Brisco:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker, just as I thank the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). After a full day in this House and a full day in my office—and the same applies to other members—it may well be that the quality of the presentation and debate perhaps dwindles somewhat as the hour approaches ten o'clock.

That should be no reflection on the sincere efforts of members on this side of this House and some from the other side of the House to be heard in their attempt to see that this bill is removed from the House, or at least amended as proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

**An hon. Member:** Right on.

**Mr. Brisco:** Mr. Speaker, one of the very interesting things in respect of this bill is the fact that in the beginning there was a wave of nationalism on the part of the Canadian public that was really quite interesting. However, that wave of so-called nationalism has waned as the public has perceived the true purpose and intent of this Liberal bill. There is no question about the manner in which my constituents and those of other members have addressed themselves to this bill. Their concern is now being reflected and is the antithesis of the proposal originally put forward in this bill by the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner).

It is interesting to note the backlash from the backwoods, to the grassroots if you like. These are the people who are most concerned and who will be affected and who will be affected. The little old lady who reads *Reader's Digest* is the type of person writing to me. These people are really concerned. Let me return to the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. I would support this amendment right down the line.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[Mr. Brisco.]

**Mr. Brisco:** Either there is support for this amendment, which is intelligent and well thought out, or the bill will be denied by this House and by this party. It is either that, or the bill must go back to the committee. I would urge that this House and the minister reconsider the decision. This debate is being prolonged and protracted, as the minister knows, simply because this side will not give an inch on Bill C-58 until it has been intelligently amended. At this point I would inquire of you, Mr. Speaker, if it would be safe to call it ten o'clock.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### AGRICULTURE—REDUCTION IN FEDERAL SHARE OF COST OF CROP INSURANCE—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO OFFSET

**Mr. G. H. Whittaker (Okanagan Boundary):** Mr. Speaker, on December 20 last I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), whether the \$10 million reduction in the federal share of crop insurance will mean that the farmers, and the provinces will be expected to cover this reduction. The Prime Minister replied: "In our cuts we are expecting everybody to bear some share of the sacrifice..." Surely the Minister of Agriculture should have said he would make cuts in other areas rather than important programs such as crop insurance, farm credit, and so on.

● (2200)

Out of a total budget of \$664 million it would have been better to reduce expenditures first in the area of professional and special services, utilities, materials and supplies, which total \$9.4 million and \$12.8 million respectively in the 1975-76 estimates, since the former too often causes morale problems, and the latter too often proves to be unnecessary.

Federal contributions to crop insurance have grown from \$16 million in 1973, to \$30 million in 1974, to \$49 million in 1975, to a projected \$62 million in 1976; and some .1 million is to be subtracted from the \$62 million. However, the federal government is already committed to give a certain level of contributions to the provinces.

What happens if the projected figure of \$62 million is reached for the level of federal contributions? Where does the crop insurance section get this extra \$10 million? No one seems to know.

In 1976 the federal government is committed to make a certain level of contributions; 1977 is different. The crop insurance people talk of restricting the amount of insurance available to an individual.

For example, if strawberries can be insured up to a 70 cents per pound level, this would be cut back to a maximum of 60 cents per pound. Does this not go against the