

Western Grain Stabilization

except for the formal ratification and approval of parliament, it is small wonder that these people are leery and suspicious of the minister.

They wonder why the minister is involved in this program. The question comes to their mind: why is this minister responsible for introducing a western grain stabilization program; why are grain commodities not under the Minister of Agriculture? Perhaps it is too complicated a matter and perhaps the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) does not understand agriculture, so the Minister of Justice, an intellectual and professor of law who understands agriculture better, will deal with that aspect of the industry. Be that as it may, it was the decision of the Prime Minister to put him in charge of that aspect of agriculture.

But having put him in charge of the Wheat Board, one wonders what other responsibilities the minister has for farmers' incomes. This could easily be handled by the Minister of Agriculture. All that has to be done is that the Minister of Justice step down. But no, this man is ambitious, and such men are dangerous. To quote Shakespeare: "Yon Cassius has a lean and hungry look". When one realizes he is a minister of transport, Minister of Justice and the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, as well as a roving ambassador, people wonder why. They would not be so leery if everything were in their favour. But in the end it always amounts to one thing, that the western farmer finally gets it in the end.

An hon. Member: Which end?

Mr. Korchinski: This is what they are concerned about. What I have tried to indicate is that western farmers do not trust the minister. I should like to quote from an article which appeared in the *Western Producer*, entitled, "Not fully sold on income plan". It reads:

The federal government has not completely "sold" farmer organizations on its income stabilization plan.

One realizes that despite several years of participation, involvement and discussions that have been going on, these farm organizations are leery, never mind the individual farmer. Farm organizations have collectively decided to be careful of the consequences whenever the Minister of Justice makes a move because there is bound to be something of which they should be suspicious. I think that what I have said will illustrate to the House and to the minister why we should not even proceed with the principle of the bill at this time. First, these questions must be answered. I understand that we must break now for private members' hour, but when I resume my comments tonight I will list the 20 questions that I have prepared for this occasion.

[Mr. Korchinski.]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche)—External Affairs—Government action to restructure relations with developing countries; the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon)—Manpower—Opportunities for Youth Program—Proposed control of grants on a constituency basis; the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke)—Post Office—Alleged lack of authority for sale of non-postal items—Government position.

It being five 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.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

Mr. Herbert: Madam Speaker, I regret the necessity of having to rise again today on the same point that I have raised before. I thought the matter was well covered last Friday. However, reference to page 43 of the order paper will indicate an error in that it shows that the first five items were passed by unanimous consent, whereas on page 5438 of *Hansard* it is clearly indicated that these motions were allowed to stand at the request of the government.

● (1700)

I do not wish to see the procedure followed every time whereby all these motions have to be listed, and if the government is again going to request that the motions preceding the one which is to be debated today are to remain on the order paper, I do not want to have them read out. I had to rise today because the reprint of the order paper does not come about until Friday, and unless I rose today they could again be printed as if there had been unanimous consent, and certainly on my part there is no unanimity to let these items remain on the order paper if hon. members do not wish to proceed with them.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): As the hon. member has stated, there are several errors on today's order paper. At page 43 under notices of motions Nos. 2, 15, 19 and 20 it is indicated that these items were allowed to stand "by unanimous consent." The notation in each case should have read "at the request of the government." The changes will be made at the first opportunity.

Mr. Reid: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, there has been discussion through the usual channels and I believe there will be consent to take the motion standing in the