

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

Mr. Pringle: I know that one could go out west and say that many farmers out there are doing well. They are not doing so well as many workers in other areas of the country. They are good people, and they are doing reasonably well. One has only to look at the financial statement put out by a wheat pools to realize that this is so. The operating revenues of this pool were some \$23 million in 1970. Their net operating earnings—not their gross but their net—amounted to about \$4 million, or 17 per cent. That wheat pool is owned by farmers and on \$23 million they made 17 per cent. I could name 1,000 businessmen who would like to make a net profit of 7 per cent, let alone 17 per cent.

Mr. Peters: The hon. member should move the motion. He has only three minutes left.

Mr. Pringle: Because of the great interest being shown in this House, especially by those in the opposition, in this bill I wish to move, under Standing Order 6(5)(a):

That we continue sitting beyond ten o'clock for the purpose of continuing consideration of the report stage of Bill C-244.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member has just moved a motion. Hon. members are aware of the provisions of Standing Order 6 (5)(a) respecting the prolongation of hours of sittings of the House. Before putting the motion again to hon. members the Chair feels it is necessary to read section (5)(b) of Standing Order 6 relating to the procedure to be followed when the motion is put. It reads as follows:

When Mr. Speaker puts the question on such motion, he shall ask those members who object to rise in their places. If ten or more members then rise, the motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn, otherwise, the motion shall have been adopted.

[Translation]

Hon. members know that Standing Order 6(5)(a) provides that an hon. member may propose to continue a sitting beyond the hour of adjournment stipulated in the Rules provided he moves the motion in the hour preceding the time of dinner recess or the time of daily adjournment.

Before I read the motion put forward by the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle), I must call the attention of hon. members to Standing Order 6(5)(b) which reads as follows:

When Mr. Speaker puts the question on such motion, he shall ask those members who object to rise in their places. If ten or more members then rise, the motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn, otherwise, the motion shall have been adopted.

[English]

All those opposed to the motion will please rise.

And more than ten members having risen:

Some hon. Members: Shame!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): In accordance with section (5)(b) of Standing Order 6, the motion is deemed to have been withdrawn.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member who has just completed his remarks would permit a question. I notice that he had three minutes left.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member's time has now expired. He can accept a question only with the unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, since the House granted me more time, perhaps it would grant the hon. member more time.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Would the hon. member kindly resume his seat. The hon. member is aware that we must abide by the rules of the House. There does not seem to be unanimous consent, and the Chair will recognize another hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: The government does not abide by its laws; why should we abide by its rules?

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment in a general way because I believe that it points out one of the weaknesses of this legislation, namely, that grain stabilization is related to gross income and not in any way to net income. I am less inclined to support the second part of the amendment dealing with 100 per cent as opposed to 90 per cent. When an individual receives money for wages, through his business or by any other means, it is not the gross receipts that are important but the net receipts after deducting the costs of production, salaries, and so on.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I feel that this amendment is most important. It puts a different slant on the grain stabilization program. It gives an indication why the western farmers are not enamoured of the proposed program. Lumping together the \$100 million pay-out and the grain stabilization program was a great mistake. I can only repeat what the Canadian Federation of Agriculture said in its brief to the Standing Committee on Agriculture on May 7, 1971. It pointed out that the bill is in two parts. I quote from the brief as follows:

The bill itself must be dealt with in two parts:

1. The vitally necessary payments to be made to prairie producers as so-called "special transitional payments" in the amount of \$100 million. These are urgently required.

2. The long-term stabilization and storage policies contained in the bill. These require much improvement.

That is what has been hung on this bill. The \$100 million has no relationship to the grains stabilization program. The pay-out is different and the gathering of the money is different. There is no reason to lump the two together. Payments made under the grains stabilization program will be based on the farmer's gross receipts for the last three years, but the \$100 million payment will be based on an acreage payment only. Out of the \$100 million, \$70 million will come from the money allocated under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. There is no connection between these two parts of the bill; they should be separated. Payments under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act should now be honoured and the grain stabilization program looked after at the proper time.