

was ever better expressed than it was years ago by William Jennings Bryan when he said: "Destroy your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms and grass will grow in the streets of every city in the land."

Mr. Dinsdale: Spoken like a true Conservative.

Mr. Richardson: That is why it is important to dispose of the amendments and pass the stabilization bill.

Mr. Korchinski: Richardson for Prime Minister.

Mr. Richardson: Let someone put that on the *Hansard* record. I realize I am imposing on the time of hon. members. I just want to add that if democracy, of which we are all proud, means anything, it means that the voices of the people are heard and that the voices of all the people help to determine what legislation will be passed into law in this place. At this point, in what we hope are the closing days of this debate, when we are trying to make a simple choice between passing the stabilization bill and continuing with the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, I say to all the farmers of western Canada: let us hear from you; let your representatives on both sides of this House hear your decision before we make our decision.

Mr. Horner: Isn't it a little late?

Mr. Richardson: This is what we want to find out. Let us hear whether you want the stabilization bill to be passed or whether you want to stay with the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. That is the most important single issue. We want to see democracy at work. We want to hear your judgment on this matter.

One last point, if I may. Again, as a western Canadian, I cannot help but reflect upon the fact that since the House reconvened on September 7 the government has put forward two important pieces of legislation, bills it wanted to see passed.

Mr. Paproski: Name them.

Mr. Richardson: One is the stabilization bill, which we are debating, to provide \$100 million to western Canada. The other is the employment support bill which came along much later and which provides \$80 million in grants to industry.

Mr. Horner: Did you take that \$80 million from industry in the first instance?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I gather hon. members would like to hear the minister continue his remarks and they have given their consent to his doing so. But since I have pointed out to other speakers the necessity of being relevant to the amendment and to the motion before the House, I want to be on record as saying that the hon. minister would appear to be wandering considerably beyond the scope of the matter which is before us.

Mr. Richardson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not know how I could possibly be more relevant than to mention the reasons for moving to a quick decision on the amendment which is before us.

Mr. Peters: The amendment is on page five.

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

Mr. Richardson: I simply wanted to draw a comparison between the \$80 million provided in the employment support bill and the \$100 million in the stabilization measure. It is estimated that only 3 per cent of the industries likely to benefit under the employment support act are in the prairie provinces. By far the larger number are in Ontario and Quebec. Both bills are government bills. The government is trying to be fair to all parts of the country. I think westerners will have to consider and observe the manner in which Conservatives and members of the New Democratic Party alike have reacted to each of these bills. I would think the leader of the Progressive Conservative party and the leader of the NDP would each wish to reflect upon the speed with which their supporters helped to get the employment support bill passed and compare that performance with the delaying tactics which are evident in passing to legislation which would benefit the west.

I wish to conclude by asserting that the government is concerned equally about all parts of Canada, and I urge hon. members to move forward to bring the amendments to a vote. We are speaking here of vital matters.

Mr. Horner: Pay the money.

Mr. Richardson: We are talking about long-term stabilization of income on the Prairies. But of equal importance we are talking about short-term prosperity, real prosperity in the west between now and Christmas. Our concern primarily is to recognize the great contribution made to Canada by the men who work the topsoil of the great plains.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: Another speech like this and that topsoil will blow away.

Mr. Richardson: I say to the members of this House that in my opinion the prairie topsoil is one of the sacred possessions of this nation. It and the men who work on that soil are not suitable subjects to be made the pawns in a political game. It is for these compelling reasons that I urge the House to reach a decision on the amendment to the motion, to reach a decision on the amendment, to reach a decision—

Mr. MacInnis: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member is seeking the floor on a point of order.

Mr. MacInnis: My point of order is this. If the minister has such feelings for the western farmer, can he not express them without reading them from a prepared text, which is against the rules of this House?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member is entitled to raise the point of order. However, I do not think it is unique for an hon. member to refer closely to notes in making a speech. In my experience here, I have observed that this quite often happens. The Minister of Supply and Services.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.