

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

been pressing the government to request the Canadian Wheat Board to make the final wheat payment for the 1966-67 crop, because they need the rest of their money. I hope the minister realizes that farmers delivering the same variety and the same grade of wheat I referred to earlier receive only \$1.28¼ per bushel for No. 2 hard wheat, and \$1.24¼ per bushel for No. 3 C.W. Durum wheat. The farmers in the constituency of Rosetown-Biggar need their final payments, and I hope they will receive them in the not too distant future. I hope I have helped the minister to understand what the western members have been talking about in respect of wheat.

Let me draw another problem to the attention of the minister which is of great concern to the people in certain parts of my constituency. We now have a dam, built or at least started during the time when the Conservative government was in power. I am sure the minister is aware of this because he was at the location last July 21. A large irrigation project will be developed downstream from this dam. Farmers there are now levelling and preparing their land. Some will be sowing irrigation crops this year. I ask the minister to use his influence with his cabinet colleagues to see whether the Minister of Finance will discontinue the 12 per cent sales tax applicable to irrigation equipment and other supplies used for the irrigation of land. I hope the government can be encouraged to give some tax incentive to the farmers in this new development area, which will be called upon to produce a great deal to answer the world demand for food supply. The minister should take a serious look at this whole question and use his influence to convince the Minister of Finance to provide tax incentives or to rescind the tax now applicable on these supplies. This will provide an opportunity for these people to go ahead with the development of this area, in order that they may increase production.

Mr. Chairman, may I call ten o'clock.

Progress reported.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the house that tomorrow we will continue with supplementary estimates, beginning with the estimates of the Department of Finance. The Minister of Finance will make a statement at the opening of his estimates.

27053-461

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to make it clear that I am not sure this is agreeable, in view of the length of time the Minister of Agriculture has taken tonight and the quality of the remarks made. We will sleep on it.

• (10:00 p.m.)

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

**PUBLIC SERVICE—PENSIONS OF RETIRED CIVIL SERVANTS—REQUEST FOR INCREASE AT THIS SESSION**

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the subject of the pensions of retired civil servants is on the late show again tonight because of a question which I put to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on Wednesday, January 31, as recorded in *Hansard* at page 6207. Initially my question on that day to the Prime Minister had to do with the business of the house. In particular I asked if he could indicate what items of legislation the government wished parliament to deal with before anything happened to the present session. The Prime Minister in reply expressed the hope that he would be able to give a list of such items shortly, and then *Hansard* reads as follows:

**Mr. Knowles:** Will the list include provision for increasing the pensions of retired civil servants, so this matter can be dealt with before the present Prime Minister retires?

**Mr. Pearson:** I would only be in a position to submit the pieces of legislation which are very urgent and of immediate importance; and while the item to which the hon. member refers is of great importance, it is not on the immediate and urgent list.

**Mr. Knowles:** Why not?

As a matter of fact, the point of my asking for this matter to be posted for this adjournment debate is to seek an answer to that question: Why not? Why is it that the matter of increasing the pensions of retired civil servants, as recommended unanimously by a joint committee of both houses in a report tabled on May 8, 1967, is not on the list of business to be dealt with before the present Prime Minister retires?

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I have not time to go over the whole history of this matter, and it is not necessary because it has been done a good many times; but there are one or two other references I should like to make at this time. On December 15, 1967, eight days after