

Canagrex Act

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): He has got that milking hand going again. Great fellow that he is, the farmers and those people who work in the food chain whom he is supposed to serve are wondering what has happened to the Minister of Agriculture in the cabinet. They are wondering where that great voice in agriculture is, because, in spite of all the rhetoric, sales are falling, agricultural incomes are decreasing, and the net is decreasing as well. This is what counts to the farmers.

I want to say this to the government. We are going to look at this bill from the point of view of the operation of Crown corporations. I do not like to see what I see happening all the time under this government. It is creating a parallel super bureaucracy of Crown agencies which is less responsible to Parliament and to the people than to present departments. It will override those separate departments. These agencies from time to time have become havens for political appointment. I hope the Minister of Agriculture does not follow the route of Jack Pickersgill with the CTC. I hope he does not do that.

An hon. Member: I didn't think of that.

Mr. Whelan: I intend to stay here for a long time.

An hon. Member: Maybe the Minister of Agriculture does have a future.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Maybe he does have a future. I hope that does not happen because I think there has to be a strong voice for agriculture in the House of Commons. But what is most important is that there has to be a strong voice for agriculture that can sway the cabinet. I am afraid that is what we do not have.

I think the government is once again establishing a corporation when there should be a direct approach to agricultural problems. The government has given us an approach. Surely to goodness the government was serious when it shuffled the sales aspect of external affairs to give us that approach. Why must we have an approach that in terms of a size of the problem can be likened to a pimple?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on the motion in the name of the Minister of Agriculture. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): It being four o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, public bills, notices of motions and private bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Shall all orders preceding No. 58 stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. HERBERT—PRINTING OF BILLS

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Prior to proceeding with Order No. 58, hon. members will recall that a point of order was raised by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) on December 3 last concerning those private members' bills that remain listed on the order paper with the notation "text received" in parenthesis and remain unprinted.

● (1600)

Hon. members will recall that earlier this session, on February 19, 1981, as a result of representations made in the House by the hon. member for Vaudreuil those hon. members who had submitted only the title of a bill in the draw were advised by the Chair that they would have to submit to the House within 30 days, or by a day to be fixed, a text of their bill, otherwise their bill, that is the order for second reading of their bill, would lose the precedence given it in the draw. As I said at the time, it was impossible to stand a bill when the bill did not exist. To put it another way, the House had been put in the position of requiring to stand many of its orders for the second reading of a bill where there was no bill to debate, only a title.

Pursuant to the decision of the Chair of February 19, the Speaker subsequently wrote to all hon. members notifying them that those who had yet to submit a text of their bill should do so by April 3, otherwise the order for second reading of their bill would lose its precedence on the Order Paper. After April 3, 1981, the Order Paper reflected the decision of the House, and accordingly the order for second reading of 164 bills, for which no instructions were given, was shown to have lost the precedence that had been accorded them in the draw.

It should be noted that the term "text" adopted by members during the discussion of this matter was required to be given a liberal interpretation because of the fact that members had, for some years, been permitted to include only a title of a bill in the draw, and also because hon. members had been accustomed to giving instructions in various forms to the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel whose duty under the provisions of Standing Order 84 is to assist hon. members of the House in drafting legislation. If a text of a bill is submitted by an hon. member, this would of course also constitute the instructions to draft a bill.