

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

who represents the riding next to mine, has made a good point. I apologize to the Chair, for the sake of those who may have thought that I had insulted the Chair and on my own behalf.

Mr. Alexander: I do not accept.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Osler: Mr. Speaker, honest and honourable people entertain honest and different points of view. Nevertheless, words are only words. They have nothing to do with cash. We agree, as the three premiers from western Canada have agreed, that what the farmers need is cash.

An hon. Member: Pay your bill.

Mr. Osler: It is no use castigating the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for what he said on television last night. One member has asked him to pay the bill; another has called him a rogue.

An hon. Member: And what does the hon. member say?

Mr. Osler: If I did not think that our Prime Minister is the best Prime Minister we have had for a long time, I would not be on this side of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: Now the hon. member is being carried away.

Mr. Osler: Hon. members can castigate the Prime Minister and rib the minister. We could spend months doing this. It might be a great deal of fun. It is lots of fun playing the game called politics. The people of Canada are fed up with this game called politics.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Osler: I am not a farmer, Mr. Speaker, but I do not want to delay this bill.

Mr. McCleave: Pay the bill.

Mr. Osler: I am not a farmer, and I will be the first to admit that this bill is not absolute perfection and does not meet all of a farmer's dreams. Actually, I am not qualified to know whether it is perfect or not; I merely know that the farmers of western Canada would rather have \$100 million than this entertainment. They do not want to be entertained with the sort of display that has been presented to the people of Canada for the past few weeks. This entertainment is cheap. We do not even charge admission here. Old parliamentarians, to whom we pay a pension, may attend. How we entertain the people of Canada is not important.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I am perfectly willing to stand on the record of this government at the next election. If the people of Canada do not like what I have helped the government to do, they can elect someone else to this House. I am damned if I am going to sit around listening to this garbage week after week while the farmers of Canada go short of cash.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Osler: The minister has made it abundantly clear—I have heard him say it—that this bill can be amended or changed. It will be open to compromise and change as time goes on. For God's sake, let's get something started. This is a new deal for the farmers. They need a new deal. It is nice to be holy at this stage, but what do we have? The people of Canada know this bill has gone through to the report stage. It has been approved in principle and this House is now deciding whether it can be accepted. Having been approved in principle, we now find—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry that I missed some of the speeches which preceded the one being made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler). I am not in a position to judge to what extent hon. members have limited their contributions to the debate on the subamendment. As the hon. member has said, there is a motion, an amendment and a subamendment. My understanding of the rules of parliamentary debate is that we should limit contributions to the question before the House. It does not help the institution of Parliament if hon. members move motions, amendments and subamendments and then entirely disregard the rules and talk about whatever they please.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I am not necessarily referring to the hon. member who has the floor at the present time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: My thought is if we are to make any progress in Parliament, not necessarily in connection with this bill but in connection with the work of the House of Commons in general, we should respect the rules. The basic rule that should be respected at all times is with regard to relevancy. If hon. members were prepared to disregard this rule at all times, I doubt that Parliament could work at all. I invite hon. members to limit their contributions to the matter before us at the present time.

Mr. Osler: I heartily concur with Your Honour's remarks. I will try to observe your counsel. I hope other members who participate in this debate will do likewise.

This amendment to an amendment is another method of implementing this bill. That is my point. Having arrived at this stage, the House is in general agreement with the bill. We are arguing about ways and means which are becoming finer and finer as the debate progresses. Perhaps this is necessary because there is a certain inefficiency to democracy and the democratic process that is worth debating because the alternatives are so disastrous and bleak. Noting Your Honour's admonition and profiting by it, I will limit my words to just one thought.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Osler: Hold it. It is a thought I would like to get into their heads, Mr. Speaker. We are at the point where we can go on with amendments and subamendments for the next year. We will probably be able to write home to our constituents and say that we again have 176 inches of snow. This will say, "Big deal; it is really rugged in Ottawa." However, you will not get a single mark unless you allow this matter to come to a vote. In a democratic