

promised various organizations, groups and people interested in legislation this House passes, to engage in consultation. That consultation has not taken place. That is too bad, and is a style of politics I call un-Canadian.

I said, when raising a point of order in the course of this debate, that it is questionable parliamentary practice for the government to ask the House to pass a bill which it will not implement or use until such time as there has been "consultation"—I put that word in quotation marks. If the government wants to engage in meaningful consultation, let it change its approach. Let it allow such consultation to take place. Therefore I say, why not send this bill back to the appropriate committee, where these clauses can be studied? Such committee, predominantly but not exclusively made up of parliamentarians from western Canada, could go out in this country and listen to men and women who may feel this bill will affect them adversely. Really, that is the intent of the amendment, and it is not unreasonable to ask members on the government side to support it.

After that process of consultation has taken place and any changes proposed have been made to the bill, it should be brought back to this House, here to be dealt with. Surely that is not unreasonable. Knowing the attitude of westerners and how they view the actions of the government, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton), seconded by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers), proposed an amendment. In so doing they highlighted a matter of great concern to the producers of western Canada.

Is it too much to ask, in the last days of this parliament, that the standing committee of the House, the appropriate committee mentioned, should have a reference from the House for the purpose of undertaking the kind of consultation I mentioned? Is asking for such consultation asking too much? I do not think so. All of us, westerners included, can judge for ourselves to what extent consultation has taken place. On the one hand we hear much talk of consultation; on the other hand we see little evidence of it.

This bill will hang like the sword of Damocles over those who will be affected by it. Unless the bill is amended, producers could be adversely affected. People will say of the government, "No matter what you say, we know what you intend to do". And they will say it, mark my words.

This parliament stands for something, Mr. Speaker. It is a representative body. Though there is much good in the bureaucracy of the country, no body of people in this country is as representative of all our people, and as sensitive to their wishes, as the Parliament of Canada. And no committee of this House perhaps is as sensitive to the needs of western agriculture, and as aware of the justified and unjustified fears and apprehensions of those involved in agriculture, as the Standing Committee on Agriculture of this House. I therefore ask all members of the House to support the amendment, the purpose of which is to allow a standing committee of this House to engage in consultations which are so necessary. We must engage in those consultations if we are to reach some sem-

blance of understanding between the various regions and areas of the country.

For the last ten years the confrontationist style of the government has plagued the country. Sometimes such a style is justified; more often it is not. Surely it is not justified in legislation of this kind. Surely we should not pass such legislation immediately, or should not pass it until people understand it. I hope the government will not proceed in this manner with regard to this serious bill, although past precedent might lead one to think that it will. If so, it shows that the government's attitude to this country is most unhealthy.

Mr. Paproski: They like to divide and conquer.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): If the government were to adopt our suggestion and accept the amendment, it could reverse the growing trend of opinion in the country regarding the actions of the government. It can do this simply by agreeing to accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain and seconded by the hon. member for Red Deer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)) which was negated on the following division:

● (1710)

(Division No. 50)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin

Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Brisco
Cadieu

Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Crosbie
Crouse