

*Time Allocation*

agriculture despite the opposition? Because the Government may very well be more enlightened than the opposition and because good decisions ought to be taken, we have to put up with a filibuster which is tantamount to an abuse of power on the part of members opposite. That is why I am upset because, if we look at cold facts, the export of food products does represent one of the most important markets for Canada. If we examine the economic situation of some other countries where the social and economic climate is worsening, we find that the first link which breaks up is the badly or insufficiently exploited agricultural sector.

So I am wondering why we are debating this emergency motion designed to limit debate on this vital and essential sector of agriculture which feeds the world. We should keep that in mind. As we are having this irrational debate when the situation is so urgent, I am wondering where we are going. Here is a piece of legislation to promote the sale of agricultural products throughout the world, therefore a measure from which, individually and collectively, Canadians stand to benefit, so I wonder why there should be any question about it. A parallel can be drawn between this bill to establish a corporation called Canagrex and the criticism levelled at other existing Crown corporations.

I find it almost mean that the Opposition should not at least have had the courage to experiment with a Crown corporation which would be all set to promote Canada's agricultural products on international markets, to help our farmers grow a wider variety of better quality products, and to sell on international markets the products which are already of very good quality and which we can make even better still. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I hope that Hon. Members will show less partisanship and less aggressiveness in a debate on such an important issue as agriculture.

• (1620)

[English]

**Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know where to begin. Parliament has been affronted by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) who stood in his place to speak on an income tax Bill which is of such importance to the farmers of this nation who are having extreme difficulties making ends meet this year. We came to the House to hear what the Minister was going to do for farmers who are in an industry which is on the brink of destruction. But what did we see? The Minister snuck in a motion of closure in a speech which I would be embarrassed to send out to the farmers in my constituency. He has moved closure on a Bill called Canagrex. The introduction of closure should only be used in exceptional circumstances.

**Mr. Whelan:** It is time allocation. That is different from closure. Use the right terminology.

**Mr. Schellenberger:** It should only be invoked when it is of grave importance for the Government to have a Bill that will assist in its program to aid farmers and the agricultural industry. Instead, the Minister has moved closure because he

could not negotiate not only with the parties in this House but with farmers in all parts of the country to get approval for his Bill.

The Conservative Party has been consistent in its views on this Bill from the outset. We have stated consistently that we are in favour of export credits and of facilitating and promoting agricultural products. We in this Party, as well as some 23 agricultural organizations across the country, are opposed to the Minister forcing his will upon the nation by means of closure without the opportunity for debate on second reading or the chance to discuss the many amendments to remove "buy-and-sell" from this Bill. One of those agricultural organizations is the Canadian Cattlemen's Association which represents farmers in every region of this country. It has demanded to be excluded from the provisions of the Bill. I wonder if the Hon. Member who just spoke, who is the Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, understands what she heard in that Committee from the many groups who appeared to say they wanted those changes.

The Minister has been unable to get agreement. If we review his record over the past ten years, we see that he has passed ten Bills in the House, only one of which is different from what has been previously passed in Parliament. The remainder have only been changes to Bills that have been brought in by previous Ministers. The only substantive Bill introduced by the Minister was the beef import law which he was forced to introduce by the cattlemen across this nation.

We have seen a Minister who has been unable to deal with the significant problems faced by agriculture in this country. His function has been to cross the country putting out fires for the Government because he is incapable of bringing forward consistent legislation that farmers agree with. The Minister has brought forward his pet peeve. While the Minister talks about obsessions, he has an obsession regarding Canagrex.

Let us talk about the agreement which the Minister is unable to achieve. On July 13 and 14, 1982, there was a federal-provincial conference at which all Ministers of Agriculture in the country were present. As a result of that conference, eight out of the ten provincial Ministers indicated their opposition to the majority of this legislation.

**Mr. Whelan:** That is not true.

**Mr. Schellenberger:** The other two Ministers said there were certain parts of the Bill which they did not approve of. The Minister is running roughshod over the provincial Ministers of Agriculture in Canada because he cannot get an agreement. As well, he is running roughshod over 23 agricultural organizations who want changes to this legislation. He is using his big club of closure.

**Mr. Whelan:** Time allocation.

**Mr. Schellenberger:** Closure. That is what it is.

When it came time for the Standing Committee, which spent a considerable length of time on this legislation, to discuss it with provincial Ministers, Members of the Liberal