

Mr. Korchinski: On the basis of my contact with farmers in western Canada, I am able to say that farmers have enough intelligence to read between the lines. I do not think they will be bought by legislation like this.

Mr. McBride: Clearly, the hon. member does not want farmers to be helped. Why does he not visit my riding in Ontario?

Mr. Korchinski: I heard my preacher friend across the way asking why I do not visit Ontario. I suggest that he might do well to listen to my remarks. I say that the government is paying out conscience money. That is all that this is, conscience money. According to Mr. Atkinson—

An hon. Member: You don't know the western farmer, Stan.

Mr. Korchinski:—and others who are in a position to make these observations, in the last two years western farmers have lost as much as \$500 million as a result of government policies. The answer to question 1,020 in my name on the order paper suggests that the amount in question is over \$600 million. In other words, that is the amount of the gross shortage in western Canada and the government is trying to make it up by paying \$100 million to our farmers. I do not think for one moment that, in view of these losses, payment of this conscience money will remedy the situation in western Canada. I suggest that although Mr. Thatcher may call an election with the help of his blood brothers who will go to his province with salves and ointments, so to speak, to heal wounds, the situation will not be remedied. This legislation is a salve; it is not salvation.

Mr. McBride: The hon. member is trying to give us hell and needs salvation.

Mr. Korchinski: It is a salve. It is conscience money. That is the essence of the bill.

Mr. McBride: Nonsense.

Mr. Korchinski: If you take the \$100 million out of the bill, what have you left?

An hon. Member: Stabilized poverty.

Mr. Korchinski: As my hon. friend says, we shall have stabilized poverty.

Mr. McBride: The hon. member is afraid of being helped.

Mr. Korchinski: If, for example, we had three years of depressed prices—

Mr. Boulanger: If!

● (12:40 p.m.)

Mr. Korchinski: We have had for the past three years. If the hon. member looks at the reply to my question 1020, he will see that it is not a question of "if"; it is a fact. I will quote the prices.

Mr. Boulanger: Do you have them?

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

Mr. Korchinski: The government whip does not think I have the figures. I will give him the figures. I have the figures for the equivalent receipts in each cash year from 1956-57 to 1967-68. In 1967-68, the figure was \$1,092 million. In 1968-69, it was \$744 million. There is another figure of \$769 million. Those were the total cash receipts for all grains, including all those in the stabilization program. If the hon. member would study these figures for two days, he would understand the impact of what I am saying.

If you have a series of three years in which the government has to contribute toward the stabilization fund, for the next three years, regardless of whether there are great sales or not, you know what will happen. You will still be in abject poverty. That is what the government is stabilizing.

An hon. Member: Poverty.

Mr. Korchinski: The government is stabilizing poverty because they want to maintain the farmers at a normal level. It is typical Liberal philosophy.

Mr. McBride: Cheap politics.

Mr. Korchinski: If it is typical Liberal philosophy, it is cheap politics. The hon. member admits that. I did not say it, he did. It is typical Liberal philosophy to maintain stability providing everyone is in abject poverty. Try to apply that philosophy to capital gains. What is the government trying to do?

Mr. McBride: That is nonsense.

Mr. Korchinski: I agree with the hon. member that it is nonsense, but so is this bill. All the government is trying to do is keep everyone at a minimum level.

Mr. Paproski: They want to stabilize that by-election in Assiniboia.

Mr. Korchinski: Many aspects of this bill are objectionable. I will try to explain these objectionable features in terms that even a Liberal member can understand.

Mr. McBride: We won't understand it after you explain it.

Mr. Korchinski: If the three year average is lower, then you take money from the consolidated revenue fund to maintain the average. It is not like it used to be. The wheat pool formerly received money from the federal government which it paid to the farmers. This will no longer be the case. The payment is going to be stabilized. In other words, it will be necessary to borrow money from the federal government and pay interest to the government. This is what we talked about when debating the other bill.

If you have three successive years of tough luck, you sell at a lower price. This is what happened in the past few years. All you have to do then is pay for it in the next three years. Even if you have an opportunity to sell at a better price, you have to repay your loan first. This is exactly what is meant by abject poverty. Stabilized poverty is probably a better term. This is where we are