

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

Mr. Baldwin: For that reason, I am glad to support it. There may be other reasons, but we intend to support it. I will give the reasons for supporting it shortly.

I think it absolutely repugnant to be requested, as we were a short time ago, by the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson) to sit well beyond the time of adjournment without any limitation as to when we would desist from the debate. Members opposite have the carriage of the proceedings of this House. For many weeks before the June recess they had every opportunity to bring forward this issue for debate, as well as other matters. Because of their incompetence, disorganization and incapacity to deal with a legislative program, they did not do so until two weeks before the time we were to recess. With precipitation and haste the minister proposed we sit for an unlimited time to deal with a matter in respect of which there are 14 amendments, including one in the name of the minister.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Sixteen.

Mr. Baldwin: There are 16 amendments. It is this kind of action which makes us challenge the bona fides of this government and all the government ministers. Before we rise, I will be asking the government House leader what the government proposes to do on Friday and Monday, and whether they feel there is such importance attached to this bill that they will bring it back on those days. Are they going to refuse to deal expeditiously with Bill C-262 which the government thought was important enough to bring in on the first day of the resumed session. I will be asking those questions. With my usual courtesy, I am giving oral notice to the government House leader so that he will be prepared to reply.

With that little detour, I will now come specifically to the amendment. We intend to support the amendment. We in the opposition, including the members of the New Democratic Party, intend to see that the farmers of this country get a fair deal. Without this amendment, the proposed legislation will work a tremendous hardship on the farmers of western Canada. I was in my constituency during the recess, and I had an opportunity to speak to a great many farmers in the area. I spoke about this amendment and other amendments to Bill C-244, and I think it is fair to estimate that 90 per cent of those involved in agriculture at the producing end will find that this bill in its present form is repugnant to them. In the absence of an amendment of this kind, which has the effect of providing that the increased cost of production must be taken into consideration in establishing what will be the stabilization fund—

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Lang: That is not what it says.

Mr. Baldwin: —the bill is an inequitable one, a monstrous bill.

The minister will have his opportunity to speak. If he wishes to speak again, I would be perfectly prepared to hear him. He could take the rest of the time available until six o'clock if he has anything useful to say.

Mr. Horner: Pay your bills.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Mr. Baldwin: I hope the House will give an additional opportunity to the minister to explain why he continues to be a lawbreaker. My hon. friend said "Pay your bills". Why does not the minister pay to the farmers of western Canada money which is owed to them under the terms of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member has taken advantage of the patience of the Chair. He should stick with the amendment as far as possible, in the short time which is available this afternoon and not go back to the subject of a debate which took place the day before yesterday.

Mr. Baldwin: I will ask for the unanimous consent of the House to allow the minister to speak, provided he deals with the questions I have raised.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member is aware that if the minister were to speak again at this time he would be in contravention of an established rule. However, as I said earlier, the House is master of its own procedure and the hon. gentleman could speak again if there were unanimous consent. I do not know what kind of precedent this would create, but I am prepared to ask whether there is unanimous consent. At the same time, the Chair is not sure whether the minister wishes to take part in the debate at this point.

Mr. Lang: I would be glad to do so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Would the House give unanimous consent to the minister to speak a second time?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): No. I would be quite happy to give consent if, before the minister took the floor, we had an assurance that the bill would be divided into two parts so that the farmers could get the money which is available to them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Taking into account the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena and some of the "nays" the Chair has heard, there does not seem to be unanimous consent.

Mr. Lang: Thanks, anyway.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): There is just a minute or two available to us before six o'clock. I wish the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson) were here because I have something to say which relates to the position he took a while ago. I do not like commenting in their absence upon the attitudes taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. However, the minister chose to leave, and he must live with it. I refer to the attempt made by the government a few moments ago to get the House to sit past the normal hour of adjournment. This practice is followed occasionally and, in other circumstances, might have been an acceptable course. But in this case it amounts to an attempt by the government to legislate by exhaustion.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. Hon. members are aware that the rule of relevancy is very important. I