

know as ARDA. All that was good, fundamentally sound legislation based on information that we got from hard experience in the 1930s and during the war years. We did get this into place pretty well in the period of the late 1950s. But the truth is that no legislation or programs produced from the minds of men are ever perfect. So we have had to improve this fundamental program as the years have rolled by.

I have mentioned western Canadian stabilization price legislation which was brought in by the Hon. Otto Lang. I did not agree with his complicated formulae, and I said so, but it was an attempt to refine and improve what we had done originally on the stabilization of income.

At that time there were four distinct proposals made by the Conservative party on how to get away from what we saw were difficulties that would arise in the western grain stabilization program brought in by the then minister in charge of the Wheat Board. The worries that we had in 1976 have proved, unfortunately, to be true. It has not worked because it does not meet the condition we have to contend with. The point raised by the hon. member for Mackenzie, was that the real problem was a group of crazy nitwits in the western world who have been running our monetary policy and who have deliberately, on the basis of a false theory, rammed up interest rates to absolutely critical levels which has made it impossible for these programs, built over the last 25 years, to work. I am speaking not only of the farm programs but of programs for the small businessman and the large businessman. The home owner has been affected and so has the whole country. We have heard about this ad infinitum over the last few weeks in the House. The positive proposals made by members of the opposition over the last few weeks on small business, the export industry, farming and home building have to be listened to by the government.

I was very pleased when I heard a week or so ago that the four proposals made by the party whip for the Conservative party were accepted in principle by the minister on the government side. Two members of the New Democratic Party supported those four proposals. These were strange words for me to hear in this House, having witnessed so much cantankerous fighting and confrontation over the last few years on subjects on which we should be working together. These subjects are usually agriculture and labour. One cannot claim there is such a thing as an ideological difference between us. It is just a question of the status quo versus a desired change. I think that the government should be congratulated. I spoke after the proposals were made. I suggested to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) that he try an income-averaging annuity for farmers. This would allow farmers to put any spare money they had into a fund on any basis they could work out individually. There would be no administration. It would be

Income Stabilization

left between the farmer and the bank, the farmer and the credit union, the farmer and the Farm Credit Corporation or any other institution. It is not necessary to have government administrators for a simple individual system. In return for getting the protection of the tax law, which business and other people get, farmers will now be eligible and the money could be lent at reasonable rates of interest of 6 per cent or 8 per cent with no loss to the tax collector. There would be no loss to the institution lending the money, and certainly no loss to the guy borrowing the money if he is getting it at 6 per cent or 8 per cent.

The proposal made by the hon. member for Mackenzie fits right into this scheme. The day after I spoke in the House I challenged the Minister of Agriculture to make an announcement that he would accept the principle, that he would work on it and bring it to fruition. I told him that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would never dare to throw him out because all farmers would be behind him and so would all members of Parliament. The minister did accept that proposal and announced it on television. I have hopes that if enough support is given to him, he will push his proposal through cabinet. It will not cost the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) anything. In fact, it would be an asset.

This proposal, which the minister accepted ten days ago, is identical to the type of proposal that has been on the Order Paper for months as a private members' motion in the name of the hon. member for Mackenzie.

We should all realize that this is a sincere and honest effort, an effort over many years, trying to get an improvement which all parties want, namely the better handling not only of our agricultural industry but of others. We should realize that constructive proposals do come from members of Parliament and the word should be spread all across the country that we can force this cabinet to move.

Mr. Knowles: Question.

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, in the few seconds allotted me, I want to say how pleased I am to be invited to speak on this subject. It is unusual for an urban dweller to speak on farming matters. However, I speak with the intention of showing my appreciation and the appreciation of the urbanites of the farmers for the contributions they are making to Canada, for the dedication they have to their work, and their contributions to our welfare.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but the hour provided for private members' business has now expired. It being five o'clock, the House stands adjourned until next Monday at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.