

in this House. I know how it applies to some areas. It applies to some areas of Canada, but not all areas of western Canada.

Mr. Lang: It will.

Mr. Horner: It will, as the minister says. First, a new program ought to be implemented before we do away with the one we have.

Mr. Lang: We have two years.

Mr. Horner: I see the minister nodding his head affirmatively in response to that remark. I do not see any crop insurance legislation on the books.

Mr. Lang: It is there.

Mr. Horner: I am talking about legislation on the books that could be applied this year, or next year or the year after. The minister suggested that we had to wait for two years in order to fully implement this crop insurance scheme. I do not know if an election will intervene in the interim. I think he meant that that legislation will not take effect for two years. I submit that the legislation we are considering will not take effect for two years. First, the farmer must average his receipts from six major grains over five years, to determine how much he is to get. Then, he must average these amounts out over the last three years. In other words, he must wait for three years before this legislation becomes effective, yet the government will have done away with the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act by July, 1971. If that act had been allowed to stay in force, farmers receiving payments under it would have received more than the \$100 million this program will make available because every year farmers receive on the average \$46 million under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act program. The minister is not denying these statements. He knows that what I say is correct. The federal government's contribution to farmers under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act would be greater than it will be under this program.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. It should be recorded that the hon. member is mistaking my views when he says that I agree with him merely because I do not argue with him. I should like it to be recorded that it is much simpler, as it was the other day, to let him know when he says something that is accurate. That way I shall not rise very often.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner: One should not really criticize the minister. One can really only feel sorry for him. As a boy, he grew up on the farm.

Mr. Lang: That is not true, either.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Haven't you grown up yet, Otto?

Mr. Horner: His father owned a farm. The minister could not bear it and swore that he would have nothing

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

to do with agriculture. When he came down here the Prime Minister did not feel that the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) was capable of handling the Wheat Board. It was decided to divide the responsibility for agriculture. The Prime Minister needed someone from Saskatchewan in his cabinet, and so the load fell on the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. I feel sorry for him because he has no love for the farm and no love for the agricultural industry. He is only carrying out the wishes of the master in trying to eradicate the small scale farmer. In any event, this program does not take into consideration the plight of the individual farmer; nor does it consider the plight of a region. It applies nationally. There must be a national catastrophe before money is paid out.

The other glaring error in the program is that it ignores the effect of inflation. We know that the farmer's costs of production are going up each year. Some hon. members may say that, to meet this, the farmer ought to become more efficient. Mr. Speaker, in the last ten or 20 years, Canada's agricultural industry has been one of the most efficient of our industries. In terms of goods produced per man hour of work, it has been more efficient than most industries in Canada. This program will fail because it does not take into account inflation and because it does not take into account farmers on a regional or individual basis. We need more flexibility and not more rigidity in our system. Our salesmen ought to be more aggressive in selling wheat, oats, barley, rye, rapeseed, flax and other produce. This legislation will create a cushion for agricultural salesmen. They will sit back and not be induced to sell. The legislation is intolerable in the eyes of many farm organizations and farmers who have followed the discussion in the House and in Committee.

I might say that even on October 29, when the minister proposed this program, he had no idea of offering farmers \$100 million. He did not even suggest that until March 15. It is interesting to note why the minister made this suggestion on March 15. At that time he realized this bill would not be accepted across the country nor would he get it through the House or the Standing Committee on Agriculture because many of the members who represent farm areas are willing to pass only legislation that will benefit the farmers. The minister knows he has to offer as a bribe this piece of the legislation. He has to use a bribe of \$100 million. The last speaker pointed out that, in essence, there is only \$45 million being offered because the minister is taking away the funds contributed by the federal government under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act and the Prairie Farm Assistance Acts.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): In speaking to Bill C-244, Mr. Speaker, I want to try to determine whether the government is concerned about the agricultural economy. I was surprised to see the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang), who is responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, become touchy when the