

That is what the Auditor General told Parliament in his Annual Report tabled in the Commons last Tuesday. Also, at a press conference he had praise for Canagrex because it is the first time the Government is willing to allow the Auditor General to conduct a full audit of a Crown corporation when he considers it necessary.

I talked to the Auditor General about that. That amendment was brought in by an Opposition Member on the agricultural Committee, the NDP member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo). It was accepted by myself as something that would put aside any suspicion of the administration of the Crown corporation Canagrex.

I do not understand why members opposite do not say that the Auditor General has approved it. The Auditor General told me that not only will it be the first time in Canada for any federal or provincial Crown corporation, but the first time for any Crown corporation in the free world that that will be allowed in legislation.

We hear a lot of talk about how badly run the Crown corporations are. One would think that we thought up all the Crown corporations. It was the Conservatives who thought up Canadian National Railways, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and many others. They are not suggesting that these be abolished.

The Tory opposition to the amended legislation really counfounds me—

Mr. Lewis: Everything does.

Mr. Whelan:—particularly when the Conservative agriculture critic, the Hon. Member for Elgin (Mr. Wise), indicated to the Committee that he felt the amendments we had made were reasonable. At that time the former Minister of Agriculture endorsed the proposal which included the buy-and-sell philosophy which has recently been at the centre of controversy surrounding Bill C-85. After four gruelling months before the Standing Committee and after the Government accepted the 14 amendments to the original 42 Clauses, the Hon. Member for Elgin said:

Madam Chairperson, obviously these amendments appear to be quite acceptable to us . . . Hopefully, I am extremely optimistic that we can make considerable progress and that we can accept the very reasonable option that I think you have put forth. I am going to ask you to understand my position at the moment, and perhaps we might have some further discussion.

I think really we have dealt with the contentious issues of the Bill and that is a very reasonable offer that you have put forth, but one that I would like to move forward on at the moment and accept and move forward with the clause-by-clause study. I am telling you that once we get a decision from caucus and if that is a positive decision, then I do not think we have to worry about the time frame.

Lo and behold, the Hon. Member for Elgin was not successful when he went to caucus. He may have been more successful yesterday. All that changed quite dramatically when some of his colleagues, who unfortunately seem to lack faith in the current agriculture critic of the Official Opposition, kicked and screamed against the amended legislation, adding to what Mr. Kirk referred to as "paranoia" about the Bill.

Time Allocation

Mr. Mazankowski: What did he say?

Mr. Whelan: Kirk, David Kirk—

Mr. Nielsen: What did he say?

Mr. Whelan: The secretary manager of—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. All remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. Whelan: This is a sound piece of legislation, legislation that has been asked for by the farm organizations—

Mr. Mazankowski: Twenty-five farm organizations oppose it.

Mr. Whelan: What the Hon. Member is scoffing at is the Canadian Federation of Agriculture—

Mr. Mazankowski: They are split on it.

Mr. Whelan: There may be some disagreement within the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whelan: There may be some disagreement in the Opposition Party. There may not be unanimous consent on our side. In a democracy you cannot always expect unanimous consent.

Mr. Taylor: Half of the nation is opposed to it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the Minister but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) began his remarks by talking about the Mother of Parliament and how we should learn from procedures in the Mother of Parliament. Oh, how I wish that could happen! Oh, how I wish in this country we had a Government of Ministers with the same sense of responsibility as exists in the Mother of Parliament! There there is ministerial responsibility in a real way. When a Minister gets caught misinforming, mismanaging or somehow failing to fulfil his responsibilities, he resigns, as Lord Carrington most recently demonstrated. When have we seen any such behaviour from this sleazy crew? For him to stand up and suggest that the Mother of Parliament is a lesson for us only to the extent of the use of closure shows abysmal ignorance of what Parliaments are supposed to be about.

A respect for conventions and practices is very much at the root of what parliamentary democracy is all about. From that Minister, his Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his Government House Leader (Mr. Pinard), you have respect for no traditions or practices. The letter of the law in its precision is the only thing that counts, and that is not always followed. Reliance on that does not create the kind of atmosphere that allows the proper conduct of a parliamentary democracy.

How can the Minister have such gall, after the way he introduced the motion under 75C in the middle of an income tax debate, a debate on a subject having nothing to do with