

*Government Orders***PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION**

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Saint-Laur-ent—Cartierville (Mrs. Maheu)—**POVERTY**—Government Position—People living below the poverty line; the Hon. Member for Saskatoon—Dundurn (Mr. Fisher)—**UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**—Proposed Amendments to Act—Impact of proposed amendments on Unemployed; the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan (Mr. Angus)—**TRANSPORT**—Subsidies to Via Rail—cuts to Via Rail—Environmental benefits of rail transit.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ADVANCE PAYMENTS FOR CROPS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-36, an Act to amend the Advance Payments for Crops Act and the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Earlier this day the Hon. Member for Lambton—Middlesex presented what we call a reasoned amendment which, for people who are listening to us, might need some interpretation. That is an amendment that leaves out all the words in the main question after the word "that" and adds other words.

The Chair has looked at the amendment proposed by the hon. member and finds it out of order. As Beauchesne's 745(4) says:

An amendment which amounts to no more than a direct negation of the principle of the bill—

—is out of order.

The hon. parliamentary secretary on a point of order.

Mr. Cardiff: Madam Speaker, I would like through you to point something out to the previous speaker from Prince Albert. He spoke about the lack of support from this government toward farmers. I want to point out that the minister did say that we had supported government extensively and I want to point out—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order. The hon. parliamentary secretary may want to participate in the debate at a later stage. Resuming debate, the Hon. Member for Algoma.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Madam Speaker, it is interesting that the parliamentary secretary is so much on the defensive, as was the minister, on this bill. They know they have practically zero support. Even the most militant Tories in this country do not support the bill. It is interesting that some 19 principal farm organizations, commodity groups from across the country, met in Winnipeg yesterday and petitioned the Prime Minister by letter after that meeting demanding that the government withdraw this bill. I did the same thing a week or so ago and lo and behold, the Minister of Agriculture withdrew that bill, C-32. Unfortunately, Bill C-36 is no better than Bill C-32 as regards the interest free cash advances.

It is hard to imagine that the Tories are really bringing in this legislation. In 1984 they campaigned that they would double the farm cash advance program, and they did, they increased it from \$15,000 to \$30,000. We supported that move. But lo and behold, when the Budget came down this year they emasculated the benefits of the program because without the interest free portion to the farm cash advance program the program is almost useless. The value will be for somebody who has a crop worth \$.5 million who might gain .5 per cent and utilize it because of the mass volume of the program or for someone who is absolutely destitute and cannot get credit any place else.

Farm organizations across this country uniformly are opposed to this program. We would like to spend some time talking about why they are opposed to it. Clearly, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the umbrella group for most Canadian farmers covering the wide spectrum of dairy producers, of fruit and vegetables producers, the pools, the UPA, the Atlantic farm groups,