

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**WEEKLY STATEMENT**

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the government House leader whether he can indicate the business of the House for the rest of this week? In doing so, would he indicate whether one or two days will be set aside for opposition days next week to permit the hon. member for Trinity and his Quebec lieutenant, the hon. member for Duvernay, to amplify their views on the economic policies of the government?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, today we will continue with the advance payments legislation and the grain stabilization bill and the Wheat Board bill. Then, we will go on with the government organization bill, the Post Office Act, the Judges Act and the Pilotage Act. On Tuesday and Wednesday of next week, we will call opposition days to give many hon. members the opportunity to praise the government.

Mr. Baldwin: It is a good thing they are not under oath.

Mr. MacEachen: Next Thursday, we will probably call the resolution establishing the Committee on Public Order.

• (3:20 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**PRAIRIE GRAIN ADVANCE PAYMENTS ACT**

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

The House resumed, from Wednesday, May 5, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lang that Bill C-239, to amend the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): At six o'clock last evening I was discussing this bill with particular reference to the handling of rapeseed because, of course, this bill would bring rapeseed under the provisions of the advance payments legislation. I pointed out to the House, and to the minister, that the government intervention in respect of rapeseed is having a bad effect and that this is very important because of the success of the rapeseed crop in western Canada over the past few years.

I gave an example of government interference in this industry and said that, even though the Wheat Board presently has no jurisdiction over that crop, the government has expressed its intention to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act to include rapeseed under the act. In fact, at present people who, according to the government, have delivered too much rapeseed are suffering from interference with their permit books. I mentioned that I made a request of the Canadian Wheat Board for infor-

Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act

mation as to the basis on which they exercised their jurisdiction over permit books relating to rapeseed. I said that over the past month or so I have been unable to get a reply.

In general, I think that the proposal of the government to bring rapeseed under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board through this legislation is ill advised because over the past few years, as the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) said, this has been a cinderella crop. It has done very well on its own. I do not think that this type of legislation or any other should be brought in which might have an adverse effect on the industry, as I believe this bill will. So, in order to give the minister a chance to reconsider his position in this matter, I would like to move:

That this bill be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. A. C. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): In taking part in this debate, my memory goes back to the time some years ago when this very important measure was brought in by the Diefenbaker government, after the subject matter had been kicked around for many years prior to that. In view of the way in which the present government drafted the bill for the grain act, one wonders what this bill means and what is the intention of the government in tampering with the original act. People in western Canada do not trust this government, and they think that this legislation might lead to the scrapping of the original act altogether.

Last night I was reading some of the speeches that were made by members of the opposition when this Act was first introduced. At that time hon. members were saying that the bill was impossible. One of them went so far as to say that the Wheat Board would resign. Hon. members have remarked on how quickly this measure became law, and how much it has meant to western Canada. The legislation is of great importance to the farmers and the producers. When one goes back through the years, one realizes what it has really meant to businessmen and to people from all walks of life, to machine companies and to people in business in all parts of Canada, because it made it possible for the farmer to meet some of his obligations.

At the time the act was originally brought in, I was a municipal official. I saw what this legislation meant to the rural communities, municipal councils and school districts because it gave people a little money to pay a portion of their taxes, which would allow the municipalities and schools to keep functioning. This is one of the reasons that I think we should be very cautious. There might be room for improvement. The bill contains provisions with regard to the interest rate and that is why I think we should go into this cautiously. We must keep in mind what this act has really meant in the past years, and the money that it put into circulation. The small amount of money that is still outstanding today gives one some idea of the value of this bill. The original act was passed in 1957.