

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

ment as such, but the fact remains that to come to a conclusion, I had to draw a parallel between the western and the eastern producer. In passing legislation on grain production we, in Parliament, must strive toward fairness to all. That must be our prime concern, and I take part in this debate with that in mind.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, though the matter concerns more specifically the members from western Canada, I too wanted to add my grain to this debate on grain.

Mr. Roch La Salle: What grain?

Mr. Matte: I see the member for Joliette thought right away that he could put in his seed.

This amendment really deserves our undivided attention. Offhand I would say it is very adequate. As it was so aptly put yesterday by my colleague the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), who brought in this House a whole stack of letters received from western producers, it is necessary to say here what the producers themselves want.

Through this amendment, we will give satisfaction to these producers who have a first-hand knowledge of their real problems and are in a position to know what should be built into this bill to improve it and to do them justice. This is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am in complete agreement with the content of the amendment. Western producers will be able to produce in a reasonable and viable manner and I hope that the East will benefit from it. In this way, we will do justice to everyone and really benefit from the tremendous advantages offered by our Canadian agricultural production.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): As the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would say "if I could get a little silence in the House . . .".

Notwithstanding the very important matter we are now discussing, during the question period earlier today it was revealed that a minister of the Crown, instead of coming before this chamber with an important report following his conversation with executives of the General Motors Corporation, decided to hold a press conference. That press conference has now come and gone, but the issues involved are still with us, namely the high and increasing level—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I am sure the hon. member will admit that we are getting a bit far away from the motion before the House at this time.

Mr. Broadbent: I intend to move a motion, Mr. Speaker. I am explaining the reasons for it.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the press conference has come and gone, but the issue, namely the high and increasing level of unemployment in this country, specifically in the automotive industry, is still with us. I think the House should have the right to hear a report from the minister on the results of his conversation this morning with executives of General Motors. Therefore, I intend to

[Mr. Matte.]

move a motion after which I intend to move that we revert to motions to enable the minister to make a statement to the House on his conversation with representatives of General Motors. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose):

That the debate on the report stage, motions Nos. 1 and 2, of Bill C-244 be now adjourned.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The Chair hesitates to put the question to the House at this time because it has some doubt as to the acceptability of the motion in its present form. First of all, in my opinion, the wording of the motion does not appear to follow the practice to which we have become accustomed, whereby such motions to adjourn are simple motions to adjourn the debate and do not relate to part of a debate only. In this particular case, the motion does not ask for the adjournment of the debate but merely for the adjournment of the report stage on motions Nos. 1 and 2. In the opinion of the Chair, the House has resumed the report stage of the debate on Bill C-244 in its entirety. The House might at this point be concentrating on motions Nos. 1 and 2, but if it is desired to adjourn the debate, a motion will have to be presented which would plainly ask for such an adjournment, and would imply adjournment for the day of debate on any sections of the bill we have in front of us, not only motions 1 and 2.

The Chair is ready to invite opinions from hon. members although I am not sure they will affect the ultimate decision. Does any hon. member wish to comment on the procedural aspect of the motion?

Mr. Horner: As I understand the motion put forward by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, it is a motion to adjourn on the condition we would then hear from the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce following his press conference with regard to the employment situation and his discussions with officials of General Motors. I do not believe one can move a motion to adjourn coupled with a condition; it has to be unconditional. Of course, the hon. member has the right to move another motion, but I believe the present motion is out of order because it seeks to impose a condition that we should then hear the report of the minister on his talks with General Motors.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Two or three points have been raised in the last few minutes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I might deal first with the point raised by the hon. member for Crowfoot. It is true that my hon. friend from Oshawa-Whitby said that the reason he was moving his adjournment motion was in order that it would then be possible to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to come in to make a statement. But there is nothing in the motion to this effect. This often happens. Even the hon. member for Crowfoot sometimes moves a motion which says such and such, and then makes a speech telling us why he has put the motion forward. That is what my hon. friend has done.

With regard to the point Your Honour raised from the chair, I must say I have a good deal of sympathy with the position you have taken. It so happens that yesterday my hon. friend from Moose Jaw moved a motion in the same words:—"that the debate on the report stage of motions