

The agreements which really make up the key issues in this whole operation of a safety net are between the federal government and the provincial governments, with only marginal impact from the farm groups.

I know the government says this is the product of a considerable amount of consultation, and I guess we have to agree with that. However, this government has also given the term "consultation" a bad name. Therefore, we are always a little suspicious that what we are getting is an opportunity to say something, but nobody is on the other side listening.

This bill is enabling legislation. It allows the federal Minister of Agriculture to make agreements with the provinces and with the producers relative to the provision of safety nets for the products they produce. The parameters of these agreements are supposed to be established in this legislation and these are supposed to be long-term safety nets.

This was not to be an *ad hoc* solution to the disasters when they arose, but was supposed to be an ongoing, permanent solution to the ups and downs of the agricultural sector. The need for a permanent stabilization program has long been part of the New Democratic Party's policy, as it was a policy of the CCF, which preceded us.

Various attempts have been made over the years to establish programs which would allow this kind of stabilization as far as agriculture is concerned. We have had the Western Grain Stabilization program, the agricultural stabilization program, Crop Insurance Act, various supply management marketing boards. All of these have been attempts to put in place a safety net program that would be permanent and satisfactory.

These attempts have worked with varying degrees of success, supply management probably being the relative easy winner among the groups. In 1985, the Hon. John Wise, then the Minister of Agriculture, made a commitment on behalf of this government to the country that he would put in place a permanent long-term stabilization program for all sectors of agriculture. I am sure John Wise is breathing easier today because I think he gave up in despair of even expanding the supply management under the ideology that was at that particular time espousing things like free trade and the selling of the country.

As it happened, the hon. John Wise left us and it has taken the government since 1985 until now to come up with some kind of an alternative to the suggestion that was put in place at that time.

### Government Orders

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Pursuant to the order made earlier this day, the House will now proceed to the taking of a recorded division.

## PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre in relation to amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-79, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act.

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

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 413)

### YEAS

#### Members

Andre	Assad
Atkinson	Attewell
Baker	Bellemare
Belsher	Berger
Bernier	Bevilacqua
Bjornson	Blais
Blondin	Bouchard (Roberval)
Boudria	Boyer
Brightwell	Cadieux
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)	Cardiff
Casey	Catterall
Chadwick	Champagne (Champlain)
Charest	Clancy
Clark (Yellowhead)	Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford	Cole
Cooper	Corbeil
Corbett	Côté
Couture	Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)	Danis
Darling	DeBlois
de Cotret	Della Noce
Desjardins	Dick
Dionne	Dobbie
Duplessis	Feltham
Ferguson	Ferland
Finestone	Flis
Fontaine	Fontana
Foster	Fretz
Friesen	Gagliano
Gauthier	Gibeau
Greene	Guilbault
Halliday	Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hawkes	Hicks
Hockin	Hopkins
Horner	Horning
Hudon	Hughes
Jacques	James
Johnson	Joncas
Jourdenais	Kempling
Keyes	Koury
Landry	Larrivée
Layton	Lee.