

*Adjournment Debate*

I can envisage a massive involvement by the state in the church, which may well have some very serious and dramatic effects in the future on a number of our church organizations.

Another interesting clause in this bill is Clause 123. It stipulates that the membership list of an organization must become public. All I would have to do to get a membership list of any organization is to simply join it. We have received some complaints about this particular part of the legislation because it causes concern to a number of our constituents, and I am including constituents of all members. The dangers of the abuse of this clause become evident. The RCMP could join an organization in order to get a membership list, and once they have it they would know what part of society these members are involved in. This could have very serious implications.

There could be two organizations which are dramatically opposed to each other. For example, one group could be the communists and the other group could be the John Birch Society. Under this legislation, a member of the communist party could join the John Birch Society and immediately have access to the names and addresses of all the members of that organization.

Members of the Ku Klux Klan could join an organization which might be sympathetic to the black people in our country. It would immediately have a list of targets and subjects for harassment. It is easy to see some of the difficulties we could be getting into.

A very simple example could be a mailing list. Some of us get very annoyed at having our names on a mailing list without our permission. Therefore, I believe that that clause presents difficulty and could lead to the discrediting of a number of organizations and lead to a number of difficulties within some of our small, private organizations.

Another clause which deals with court involvement in our charitable organizations is Clause 130. Under Clause 130 a member may dispute the election of a director. Not only can he dispute it among the membership, he can dispute the appointment or election of a member in the courts of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is ten o'clock.

● (2200)

### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE—REDUCTION IN INTEREST RATE PAYMENTS  
MADE BY FARMERS

**Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette):** Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak about a very important topic which I raised with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) in this House on December 3 concerning items in the budget which were supposed to be there as a result of some of the statements the Minister of Agriculture had been making across the country prior to November 12. He had left the impression that if there was not substantial help forthcoming in the budget for farmers, he would resign.

I want to put what is in the budget in the best perspective I can. What is in the budget for agriculture is \$50 million. That \$50 million is made up of an additional \$45 million for loans and \$5 million to be used to keep interest rates down. The \$5 million sounds like a lot of money. By the admission of the federal Department of Agriculture in some of its advertisements, there are about 330,000 farmers in Canada, and that \$5 million works out almost exactly to \$15 per farmer. That is really an incredibly small amount of money to be made available to farmers at this time. The reason I say that amount is incredible, ludicrous and insulting is that, on the average, farmers are paying in excess of \$7,000 in interest. When we compare that \$15 to the average \$7,000 farmers are paying, that puts into perspective the kind of aid for farmers there really is in the budget.

In addition to being responsible to the farmers of this country, the Minister of Agriculture has a very large responsibility to consumers. Without a healthy agricultural industry which has some hope for the future, the consumer of the country would be very badly served. We can produce food cheaply; that is the main reason we have the standard of living we have. If the agricultural industry declines, that will be felt by farmers immediately, but ultimately it will affect all of us. It will affect the way we live. It is for this reason that the Minister of Agriculture has a responsibility not just to the agricultural community but to the total community across the country.

The minister has been able to accomplish little for farmers in the budget, and that is a serious matter for farmers. It is serious in another respect. Canada is very wealthy in natural resources. We also have farmers as a resource. I am a farmer, and I am proud of that fact. There is more arable land per farmer in Canada than in any other country in the world. That means we have a responsibility not just to ourselves but to other people around the world to produce as much food as we possibly can, but it is becoming increasingly difficult to do that because of some of the things the minister has done, or not done, during his tenure in office. The minister has held his portfolio since 1972. He makes no bones about the fact that he took a brief sabbatical. In fact, he looks on that in a laughing way, as if it were his divine right to be where he is. It was unfortunate for him he was forced into that sabbatical, but fortunate for farmers and too bad he was not forced right out.