## Crop Insurance Act

Mr. Gleave: Yes, perhaps that is his right.

**Mr. Paproski:** Why don't you two go behind the curtains and argue this out?

Mr. Gleave: But this is irresponsible.

Mr. Whelan: It is not.

Mr. Gleave: I suggest it is irresponsible-

**Mr. Whelan:** Why does the hon. member not talk about crop insurance? We are here to debate crop insurance.

Mr. Nowlan: If you can quit quibbling, we will get on with it.

**Mr. Whelan:** You people had a good chance to do that. It could have been passed by unanimous consent on two or three occasions.

Mr. Nowlan: We said we would get on with it.

Mr. Whelan: I don't care what was said.

Mr. Nowlan: Well, we do. What does the record show?

**Mr. Whelan:** I don't care what the hon. member is saying, as the record shows that they did not take the chance to pass the bill.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I do not know if the remarks of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) are coming through. There seem to be quite a few interventions. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar has been recognized by Mr. Speaker and he has the floor.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, in case there is any question about our position on this crop insurance legislation, let me say that we favour it. It will be a worth-while measure. It will assist to stabilize the income and production of farmers. That is the purpose of the bill. I welcome the opportunity afforded by this afternoon's debate to correct some of the erroneous impressions that have been left in the countryside, and to set the record straight.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I, too, am pleased to participate briefly in the third reading debate on Bill C-129, an act to amend the Crop Insurance Act. I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) and to some of the very misleading interjections of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). When the minister speaks I hope his remarks will conform with the record, let alone with the rules of this House.

I was interested in the remarks of the speaker who led off this portion of the debate. The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), outlining in a general way the purposes of Bill C-129, the crop insurance bill, said that it was to protect farmers against certain natural disasters or natural hazards. As I said, I listened to him with interest. I had read the bill previously but I read it again. The one thing I could not find in the bill was any provision which would protect farmers against one of the worst natural disasters from which they could suffer, namely, the Minister of Agriculture.

[Mr. Whelan.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

**Mr.** Nowlan: If the minister would amend the bill and incorporate a provision relating to that natural disaster, I know that we on this side of the House would pass it without further delay because we would be doing the farmers a service.

Mr. Whelan: The record will show what is what.

Mr. Nowlan: The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar quoted from the minister's notes for an address to the annual meeting of the Canadian Mushroom Growers Association at Toronto. I think the minister has been speaking too long and too often to the mushrooms and toadstools of the land. He thought he could fool the farmers of the land with the type of remarks he made last night, in just the same way as he tried to fool them with the type of remarks he made in Alberta several months ago when he accused the House leader of my party of holding up this minor piece of legislation, as he calls it. Not only has the minister done a disservice to society; he has insulted the intelligence of farmers of this land because he thinks they cannot see through that type of loose rhetoric.

**Mr. Whelan:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the record shows that the House was asked for unanimous consent on two occasions to pass this bill and that on at least two occasions that party refused such consent at the instigation of their House leader.

An hon. Member: Right on.

• (1740)

**Mr. Nowlan:** Someone from the rump or the prices committee, which is almost the rump, said "Right on". Let's leave the prices committee and Beryl Plumptre for those plums on the opposite side who speak about right on.

I want to get to the record before me and to the two committee reports. We had a total of three hours and ten minutes during two days' debate in this House. That involved a total of 13 speakers of which the Conservative Party produced only four. If that is a filibuster, blackmail or non-co-operation, this minister had better get back to the mushroom patches of this land so the farmers can get on with serious business.

I am glad the minister raised his point of order. It was my next point in the natural, orderly, logical sequence of these few remarks.

Mr. Lefebvre: Keep it non-partisan.

Mr. Nowlan: I always do. I always try to keep it objective and conforming to the record, something which members opposite find hard to follow. Bill C-129 was given first reading on January 22, 1973. As the hon. member for Moose Jaw said, it was given second reading on March 29. The debate on that Thursday started at eight o'clock in the evening. There was a total of eight speakers, ten pages in Hansard. We know how much Hansard is full of loose pages. On that occasion there were three speakers from the Conservative Party, two from the New Democratic Party, one Social Crediter, the minister and one other