

Liberal. It is rather remarkable that there were eight speakers between eight and ten o'clock that evening.

The next great hold-up, the next great insult to the farmers, was on a Wednesday. When participating in the debate on April 18, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) said he was disappointed the minister was using this bill as a filler. On April 18, the second and last day this bill appeared in the House of Commons, there was a grand total of five speakers. Those speakers did not begin until after the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) presented his orange paper to deal with the blues of Canadians because they did not have an adequate social program. Members commented on the orange paper. Two committee reports were presented. This was followed by a debate on the Judges Act, debate on the Aeronautics Act, and routine proceedings. There were five speakers, 16½ pages of *Hansard*, on that occasion. This minister who knows mushrooms, and certainly knows tomatoes—

Mr. Whelan: And I know politics and I know what you are doing right now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: As the hon. member for Moose Jaw said, in terms of the order of government business, if this Minister of Agriculture had influence in the cabinet he would get the government business affecting farmers on to the floor of the House of Commons in direct relation to the volume of voice he has used to try to bamboozle the farmers across this land. The House of Commons has been meeting since January 4 of this year and we have had a total of 13 speakers on this bill, four of whom were from the Conservative opposition.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: You were not there. You do not know. You are a nice man, and I would not want to involve you in crop insurance or any other type of insurance because you would be a poor risk. Your insurable interest in terms of the life of this parliament may not be that much.

Where did the great hold-up come? Where was the non-co-operation and filibuster? The bill was referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture, which met twice. On Tuesday, June 5, the committee met for an hour and 18 minutes. It met at 9.44 and at 11.02 it adjourned to eight o'clock the following Thursday, June 7, when the committee considered the bill for an hour and 50 minutes. There have been 13 speakers in the House, and a total of three hours consideration in two committee meetings. Yet the minister is trying to say that the opposition, Conservative, NDP and one independent, has held up this bill. The only thing that has held up this bill in the House of Commons is that in his present capacity the Minister of Agriculture is a voice in the wilderness.

Mr. Whelan: Tell us how fast you passed the veterans affairs bill.

Mr. Nowlan: Although the minister has made some good speeches, telling audiences what they wanted to hear, he does not have the guts to be frank with them about the crop insurance bill. He picked a poor bill about which to say there has been a filibuster.

Crop Insurance Act

Mr. Whelan: I did not say there was a filibuster.

Mr. Nowlan: The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy) knows what happened in that committee. I am glad to see the chairman of that committee here. He knows full well what happened in committee. The debate on the merits of this bill in committee was not that long because no one protested them. As the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar said, it does not pronounce any new policy. In committee, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) introduced an amendment. The chairman ruled it out of order for procedural reasons. It was a money bill and an amendment to an amendment. Then what happened in the great onslaught against the farmers of this land? The committee unanimously passed a resolution put forward by the hon. member for Red Deer. I will not read the entire resolution. It appears in *Votes and Proceedings* for Friday, June 8, and reads in part:

Your committee recommends that the government consider the advisability of amending the Crop Insurance Act to include provisions for total insurance on a spot-loss basis against actual loss arising from destruction of or damage to a crop or crops, otherwise insured under this act, from one specific hazard in any area or areas in a province.

If I have misconstrued, misinterpreted or been selective in my summary of a very short record on a very small bit that does very little for the farmers of this land, I want the Minister of Agriculture to stand in his place and correct me. It was the effect of that resolution which was unanimously passed in committee that caused most of the debate in committee.

The minister knows full well that whenever the bill was brought forward it was another filler, just as it is today. It was slipped in today because we passed the family allowances bill and a few others previously. The minister is a great fellow, but because of the party to which he belongs we obviously have differences from time to time. However, as a minister of the Crown it was unbecoming of him to maliciously malign the House leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and say that we held up the insurance bill when he knows full well that whenever the government House leader was asked what we intended to do in this debate he said we wanted to do what I am about to do. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar got close to doing it. We always wanted to have some debate to find out what the minister did with the unanimous resolution of the committee, a resolution that would do something for crop insurance. It would extend the terms of this bill so that the farmers of this land would have a lot more protection from natural disasters, rather than this man-made one. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason our House leader was not prepared to say, whenever the question came up and the government House leader was looking for a filler; Oh, yes; we will let third reading go without putting up a speaker."

● (1750)

I, like other members who have an interest in agriculture, was amazed, even though one of the ministers of agriculture who is absent doesn't know what the agricultural areas of Canada are, that the minister did not speak first. Perhaps I would not have spoken had he told the House what he was prepared to do about the resolution extending the terms of the Crop Insurance Act so that it would become even more meaningful to the farmers of this