

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

● (1600)

Motion agreed to bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Knowles: The ghost of Mackenzie King will walk tonight.

Mr. Regan: He may give me some advice.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Does the House have a mind to consider Bill S-10, or shall I move on to private members' hour?

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I would think it would be advisable to move on to private members' hour.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

SOCIAL SECURITY

ADVISABILITY OF IMPLEMENTING CASH ASSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of implementing a Cash Assurance Program (CAP) which would provide stability of income in the agriculture and other food industries (fish), make pay-outs on an individual basis, provide cash in the year of low income, replace or complement certain other programs, minimize the requirements for capital borrowing from institutions, provide equity for contributors, reinforce the family farm and minimize the exodus from the agriculture and other food industries, and avoid erratic pricing of food to the consumers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, again I find myself in the position of reintroducing a proposal which I have presented to this House on previous occasions. Although time has passed and there have been a few changes in the situation, what really has occurred is that the problems have increased, or have been compounded, since my first proposal on January 26, 1976, during consideration of the Western Grains Stabilization Program. At that time the minister in charge was not too receptive to this idea. However, since then we have had a change of government and there was a change in Parliaments and in the attitude of the government.

When I proposed my motion on November 26, 1979, as it appears at page 1701 of *Hansard*, the Conservative government accepted it and allowed the motion to pass. I might mention that the previous introduction of this measure was on January 26, 1976, and it appears at page 10306. I mention those references in case anyone wants to refer to the comments I made on those occasions or the comments of others who participated in those debates.

Income Stabilization

When my motion was passed it was one of the few occasions since I have been in this House over the years that a private member's motion of substance has been accepted. That was somewhat of a rare occasion and I was elated because from that point I felt things were going to move. On November 26, 1979, when I introduced the motion, the Liberal hon. member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Ethier), made these comments:

This motion is almost a complete replica of the program which the previous minister of agriculture, the hon. member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Whelan) was in the process of implementing prior to the May 22 election.

Suffice it to say that at that time there was an indication of complete support on the part of Liberal members as indicated by those remarks. The hon. member for Bellechasse at that time was a Creditiste member who also supported the proposal, as did the spokesman for the NDP, although he made some comments also about what he wanted in the proposal. Those comments were welcomed at the time. I said at the time I introduced my motion that I would welcome any additions or deletions in the hope that this plan might be put into effect.

As I saw it at the time, and still see it, the present stabilization measure is inadequate because pay-outs following a disaster, whether it be a drought or what have you, are made in the year following the disaster. We witnessed the drought situation last year which had such serious consequences for the cattle industry. At that time we saw the implementation of the herd maintenance program. To this date pay-outs have not been made under that program, and it is now almost a year since that disaster. Similarly, pay-outs under the present stabilization program cannot be made until the following year. What happens is that the year following such a disaster we could experience, as we are at the moment, increased sales to Russia to which a considerable amount of grain is to be sold. As a result, pay-outs are made at the wrong time. In these days of high interest rates and high energy costs people need cash.

Let us consider the current situation of freshwater fishermen. Statistics would indicate that many freshwater fishermen have simply walked away from this occupation. Some thirty years ago there were 250,000 freshwater fishermen. Today there are about half that number. These people have simply left that industry.

People are walking away from various industries, many of them going bankrupt, because there is no cash flow. These people cannot provide a living for themselves and their families. What people really want is stability for themselves and their families. They have responsibilities to their families and other commitments they have to keep. These people want to work but they are unable to find a living. There is a desperate need for cash flow. It is particularly so in times of disasters.

Perhaps I could relate the situation to the grain industry more easily because there are so many variables or ups and downs in that industry. Let me refer specifically to the quota system. Just two years ago I remember there being a quota in one area of 2.9 bushels per acre, with another quota of 7 bushels per acre in an area just a few miles away. That is a man-made situation. Now we have high interest rates with an