

control of the voting shares of the CDC, as envisaged by the government, should rest with the private sector. For that reason, the amendment is not acceptable to the government.

● (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the words of the parliamentary secretary as he stated the government's position respecting some of the amendments we have presented to the House. The only conclusion one can come to is that there is no debate. We are asking why the government has done these things in the hope that we might have some explanation, perhaps receive some explanation with which we might agree, or acquire some understanding of the government's motivation. Instead, all we get is a reiteration of the government's position and a statement that there is a difference in philosophy. We know there is a difference in philosophy. This is one of the things this House is all about. This is not good enough. It is not good enough for the parliamentary secretary to say the government feels one way and we feel another way, and that this is the reason it is being done in this way. We want genuine debate on the matter. We want the government to defend its position and explain why it places its reliance on the private sector by insisting on a majority interest being maintained for the private sector.

We received no information except a statement that this is what the government has decided. In a matter as important as the Canada Development Corporation, one would have thought the government at least would have had the courtesy to explain to the House its reasons. My friend the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has given a most lucid explanation and argument concerning why there should be greater provincial involvement. I would have thought the merits of his case were obvious, and that the amendment as described and presented by the hon. member for Greenwood would have commended itself to the government which would have seen this as an opportunity to have participation by the provincial and federal governments. Instead of replying to the arguments which have been presented, the parliamentary secretary has simply restated the government's position. The government has decided to do it their way. At no time has there been any explanation from him of the reasons. We can do little more than express our great disappointment that the government has not been able or willing to either make a case or present it to this House.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question on the motion now before us? It is motion No. 12 standing in the name of the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act

Mr. Speaker: Again, pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion will stand deferred. Since discussion on all motions has now been completed and all votes have been deferred, I should like to inquire of hon. members whether it is proposed that the vote be taken now or be held over until later.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find agreement in the House to defer the recorded votes on all these amendments until eight o'clock tomorrow evening. As I understand it, tomorrow is to be an allotted day and under the special order government business will commence at eight o'clock tomorrow evening. Accordingly, I believe there is agreement that the votes be taken at eight o'clock tomorrow evening, at which time we may be able to proceed immediately to third reading.

Mr. MacLean: That is agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, Mr. Speaker, that has been agreed. I refer to both suggestions, that the vote be deferred until eight o'clock tomorrow evening and that if the government wishes to do so it may call the bill for third reading.

Mr. Speaker: There is apparently unanimous consent to the procedure suggested by the parliamentary secretary. As it is agreed that the votes will be taken at eight o'clock tomorrow evening and following the voting there will be consideration of third reading of the bill, is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

* * *

PRAIRIE GRAIN ADVANCE PAYMENTS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING RATE PER BUSHEL, EMERGENCY PAYMENTS, EXTENSION OF APPLICATION TO RYE, FLAXSEED AND RAPESEED

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-239, to amend the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has studied the motions proposed under Bill C-239 to amend the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act and I should like to suggest for consideration of hon. members the following procedure which might well be followed. I would suggest, first, that motion No. 1 should be put and disposed of separately. Then, motions Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 might be grouped for purposes of debate and a vote on motion No. 2 would dispose of all the said motions. Motion No. 6 might be considered and disposed of separately. Motion No. 7 might create procedural difficulties because at least at first blush there would appear to be financial implications. The Chair, however, would hear argument when motion No. 7 is called. If hon. members are in agreement