

*Prairie Grain Stabilization Act***PRAIRIE GRAIN STABILIZATION ACT****PROVISION FOR PAYMENTS TO WESTERN CANADA PRODUCERS IN YEARS WHEN RECEIPTS BELOW FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE**

On the order:

April 29, 1971—Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Agriculture of Bill C-244, An Act respecting the stabilization of prairie grain sale proceeds and to repeal or amend certain related statutes.—The Minister responsible for the Wheat Board.

Mr. Gleave: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I draw to your attention the fact that this bill actually carries within it two separate proposals. For that reason, those two proposals ought to be separated and two bills ought to be prepared accordingly.

In support of my request, may I draw to your attention that clause 32 of this bill deals with the payment that will be made directly out of treasury funds. It will be a payment made for one year, on an emergency basis, to meet the situation which the government recognizes as existing, whereas the rest of the bill deals with the long term proposal for prairie grain farmers. The long term proposal will be reviewed in 1976 and at that time we shall determine whether the amounts, deductions and so forth are adequate for the program. It is, therefore, an ongoing program which will last not for five years but for a number of years thereafter. I, therefore, submit to Mr. Speaker that this House should have the opportunity to examine carefully that long-term, ongoing program in the light of its implications for the future of the farmers of western Canada. In view of the urgency of the farming and economic situation on the Prairies, the short-term program should receive the immediate consideration of this House so that the distribution of moneys involved in clause 32 can be undertaken without delay. I say that because we are very close to and, indeed, into the costly planting period in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Alberta and that part of British Columbia which is affected by this bill. I, therefore, ask Your Honour to give this matter urgent consideration and permit us to deal with this bill in the manner suggested.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Lang: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Points of order urging the separation of bills have been argued from time to time before Your Honour, but rarely, I would think, on a ground more tenuous, less substantial, than in this particular case. The total content of this bill has been before producers for discussion for some six months, now. The transitional feature to which the hon. member referred is tied into this legislation and is totally based upon the stabilization provisions contained in the body of the bill as well as the repeal of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, which is likewise provided for in the measure. The contents are tied completely together, as I had occasion to indicate to the hon. member when he raised this matter in the House earlier. It would be a great disservice, and most misleading in some ways, to separate these issues, to indicate that the payment was separate and distinct rather than part of a total plan, a total package, as it is.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard).]

Mr. Korchinski: In support of the argument presented by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, may I say that though I cannot quote the particular reference in *Hansard*, I did on one occasion ask the minister whether the amount of money involved here was tied into any particular plan or program. He replied that it was simply a figure which had been accepted and that it was no way contingent upon anything else; it was simply a transitional payment. This being the case, the operation of the bill before us is not, as a whole, contingent on the existence of clause 32 at all. The clause serves no useful purpose, though it did so on one particular occasion. An item in the estimates would have served the same purpose. It is true a vote would have been necessary in the House. But it would not have been necessary for the House to accept all the other clauses of the bill, subject to the modification of certain clauses to which hon. members might for one reason or another take objection. The difficulty here is that one has to accept the measure as a whole, together with one clause which is not necessarily related in any way to the operation of the legislation.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you take time to consider whether this particular clause is in any way related to the operation of the stabilization provisions, or whether the stabilization bill might not stand without the inclusion of that clause.

Mr. Horner: I, too should like to support the point of order raised by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar. Basically, this bill is a long-range income stabilization program for farmers in the Prairie provinces. The transitional or temporary payment with which clause 32 deals is intended merely to meet a situation of short-range need. I urge Your Honour to consider the separation of those provisions, particularly in view of the desperate situation Prairie farmers face and the seeding expenses which will need to be met early this spring.

The bill before us has just begun its long progress through the House and the committees. If clause 32 is contingent upon this bill passing, as I understand to be the case, payments could not go out to farmers until July 31 at the earliest when the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act expires. I see the minister shaking his head in a negative manner. I am pleased to note this response. I hope I am right in reading his negative shake correctly. In my judgment, the transitional payment dealt with in Clause 32 would be readily accepted by the farmers as a means of bridging the short-term gap. But if it is tied in with the other long-range proposals, it would appear to be a bribe, an inducement for farmers to accept the long-range proposals as a price for obtaining the benefits of temporary financial assistance. I do not believe this is the proper way in which legislation should be submitted. It should stand on its own feet, and in these circumstances I believe the Chair should seriously consider separating the two aspects of legislation before us.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the point of order raised by my hon. friend from Saskatoon-Biggar is, as the minister pointed out, not a new problem for the Chair. It has arisen repeatedly over the years. I suppose the most recent case which did create a