

**An hon. Member:** To Russia with love.

**Mr. Alexander:**—And I know he is concerned about our senior citizens. Since inflation is eating up the old age security payments to our senior citizens, I wonder whether the Prime Minister would give serious consideration at this time to replacing the cost of living index—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest to hon. members that this is an abuse of the rules of the House of Commons. Since The Standing Orders provide 40 minutes for the question period, an hon. member should not be given an opportunity to ask a question under the guise of a point of order. He should wait until the next sitting day. If on questions of privilege or points of order an hon. member asks a question after the period has expired, it is unfair to other hon. members when they are not recognized. Why should this not also apply to the other five or ten hon. members who have not had an opportunity to ask a question? I really think this is not a legitimate point of order. I respectfully suggest the hon. member that I should not be required to rule on the point in any event.

**Mr. Alexander:** I rise on a question of privilege. With respect, the only reason I rose is that the Prime Minister indicated he would look at *Hansard* to see what my question was and then give me the answer. The Prime Minister is going abroad. I did not mean to breach the rules, but I thought I would ask him the question in order to get an answer before he leaves the country.

**Mr. Ryan:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I respectfully draw to Your Honour's attention that I have risen many times in my place for three days and have failed to be recognized. I trust that this position will be recognized.

**Mr. Speaker:** I apologize to the hon. member. He knows that I have tried to recognize him. If the hon. member will look at *Hansard* for the past month or so, I feel that he will see that he has had his fair share of questioning time. I believe that very sincerely.

**Mr. Lundrigan:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, related to the point raised two days ago in regard to the length of the question period. This morning the Prime Minister was made aware of an official representation that he should discuss the Atlantic fishery when he visits the Soviet Union. The hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe was about to raise that question with the Prime Minister today, but the question period expired before he had an opportunity to do so. As a result, the Prime Minister will not have had an opportunity to respond before leaving for the Soviet Union as to whether he will accept the representation officially made to his office to discuss the Atlantic fishery. In view of the fact that other members have raised a similar question, this is an appropriate time to ask if the House leaders and Your Honour will consider extending the question period beyond 40 minutes, in view of the fact that the serious unemployment crisis is taking up most of the question period, so that members may have a chance to ask their questions.

#### *Prairie Grain Stabilization Act*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I understand the request of the hon. member. He is suggesting that the House agree. But that is not a decision for the House leaders, or for the hon. member or the Chair to take. If hon. members are unanimously agreed to ask questions and receive answers all day, that is their privilege, but it has to be unanimous. That is the only way the Standing Order can be amended. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent. As the hon. member knows, this is the only way that the question period can be extended. If hon. members wish to change the rules in order to have a longer or a shorter question period, as the case may be, it would have to be done in the usual way, that is, by a motion after the 48 hours notice as required by the Standing Order, or by means of a recommendation from the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, to which hon. members may want to give some thought. Orders of the day.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### PRAIRIE GRAIN STABILIZATION ACT

#### PROVISION FOR PAYMENTS TO WESTERN CANADA PRODUCERS IN YEARS WHEN RECEIPTS BELOW FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE

The House resumed, from Monday, May 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lang that Bill C-244, respecting the stabilization of prairie grain proceeds and to repeal or amend certain related statutes, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

**Mr. R. R. Southam (Ou'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to present my views on Bill C-244 or what is commonly referred to as the prairie grains stabilization act. Before doing so, I would like to compliment some of my colleagues from western Canada, including the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey) and the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski), for their very comprehensive review of this bill. They have expressed many of the opinions to which I would have referred, but I will not bore the House by repeating them.

The proposal to introduce this legislation was first brought to the attention of the House on October 29, 1970, when the minister responsible for the wheat board released a 20 page brief to members and the public entitled "Proposals for a Production and Grains Receipts Policy for the Western Grains Industry". The reception of these proposals by western farmers has been very cool, to say the least. After their experience with the Lift program, the present difficulties which the government is