

[English]

## POLITICAL PARTIES

## NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S FUND RAISING CAMPAIGN—OFFER OF FREE VACATION

**Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, "free beer for all the workers" is passé. Today's NDP is much more sophisticated. The latest gimmick is to offer Party supporters the chance for an all-expenses paid vacation to—you guessed it—that socialist paradise, Hawaii, U.S.A. Thence the lucky winners will travel to Australia and New Zealand where they will be able to study the prosperity brought about by the free trade agreement between those two countries.

New Zealand's burgeoning economic health due to deficit cutting, tax reform, privatization, grant and subsidy elimination, and public service reduction—exactly the opposite of NDP policy—will round out the education.

The NDP should be careful. Any socialist taking this trip is likely to come back a committed free enterprise Conservative.

\* \* \*

## AGRICULTURE

## POTATO STABILIZATION PROGRAM—CHANGE IN PAYMENTS FORMULA URGED

**Mr. George Henderson (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring an important issue to the attention of the House. The federal Government's potato stabilization formula for calculating payments to Prince Edward Island farmers is unacceptable to small and medium-sized potato producers.

I speak on behalf of the many potato producers in Prince Edward Island who have contacted me regarding their opposition to the federal Government's decision to deduct the 1985 diversion payments from the recently announced stabilization payments.

When world over-production resulted in rock-bottom prices these farmers participated in the diversion program to take their potatoes off the market to enhance the return for potato producers in all of eastern Canada. They had no idea at that time that they would later be subject to penalties under a future stabilization program.

Because of the formula in place the small producers will be hit the hardest because they diverted all or most of their potatoes off the market. Some will not receive any stabilization payments at all.

I now urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) to listen to the voice of Island farmers and change the stabilization formula to ensure that the most disadvantaged farmers get their fair share.

S. O. 21

## SPECIAL CANADIAN GRAINS PROGRAM

## ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS ACROSS COUNTRY

**Mr. Bill Gottselig (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, the first cheques for the 1987 Special Canadian Grains Program are now on their way to western grain producers. This marks the second year the Government has put this program in place to assist hard-pressed producers.

The program for 1987 has been improved substantially by recognizing summer fallow and the additional costs of production for farmers who irrigate. Specialty crop production, processed alfalfa, and honey producers are also recognized as suffering as a result of the depressed prices in the international market-place.

What a change from the previous Liberal Government whose Leader pitted one region of Canada against the other. The Government has provided assistance through the Special Canadian Grains Program regardless of whether the grain is produced on the Prairies, in the Okanagan Valley, the Maritimes, or any other region of Canada. That's performance, Mr. Speaker; that's performance.

\* \* \*

## SIKH ORGANIZATIONS

## CRITICISM OF MINISTER'S LETTER

**Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians have been surprised in recent days to see the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) advising the provincial Premiers not to meet with three Sikh organizations. They have been told that the activities of these organizations have been a significant irritant in our relations with India. The Indian High Commission, however, denies having complained about officials meeting with these organizations.

Canadians have reason to be concerned about the Minister's action. Are there precedents for such a request to discriminate among organizations? Has the Canadian Government responded before to the concerns of foreign Governments and asked provincial Premiers to boycott certain Canadian organizations? Have other organizations, regarded by foreign Governments as being hostile but never found guilty of any seditious activities, been subjected to such actions by any Canadian Government?

It is one thing for governmental agencies to ensure that the laws are not broken, that violence is not encouraged, and that Canadian resources are not used to foster terrorism anywhere. It is quite another for Premiers and provincial Ministers to be discouraged from meeting with organizations of Canadians linked to and supporting a minority in another country.

If the Department of External Affairs were as sensitive to the Canadian policy of multiculturalism as it is to the representations of foreign Governments, this would be a