

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Korchinski:** I will accept what the minister has said. But obviously we did not need a Liberal in the House, since, obviously, a step has been taken.

**Mr. Lang:** Some of us doubled our work, that is all.

**Mr. Korchinski:** Act two! Everybody gets excited. The word goes out. The press publishes it. The minister goes on television to talk about the greatest break-through in a century. Everybody is wondering how are they going to pay it. Would it be in the form of acreage payments? No, too much like the Diefenbaker years. The debate is taken up by various commentators. Then act three comes along. The minister invites the ministers of agriculture from the three prairie provinces. They are meeting to discuss how this will be paid out. The ministers get together with their officials and begin working on the plan. Of course, there is much publicity. They are at work. There are consultations. Then, of course, we go on to act four. The farm organizations are asked how they would like to have this payment. Everybody is at work. Look at all the publicity we are getting. Everybody is busy at the pool committees. It is discussed at the country elevators. They submit representations and the delegates at the pool offices get their heads together. Farm unions are taking credit. So everybody is busy, and that is the end of act four.

• (1540)

We now come to act five. The Throne Speech announces some acreage payments. Do you think for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that that announcement was made at a time when the minister did not know how the payments were going to be made? He must think people are stupid and tries to let everyone run around in circles. The reason we have been losing what sales to Japan, according to some reports, is that we do not have sufficient ships available at Vancouver.

Then, to add to the drama the minister introduces act six, wherein he refuses to give the House information. When this question was raised in the House today the minister refused to give information, and as a result there is more waiting, more guessing. Are the payments going to be related to this or to that? Will they be paid directly to the farmers or be paid into the pool, now that the pool accounts have been closed off? Or will they be paid at the end of the crop year? All of these are possibilities. And so we add to the drama.

Having said that the pool accounts are closed off now reminds me that last year the payment had to wait until there was an election in the province of Saskatchewan. For some reason they could not close off the accounts; there was supposed to be too much work at the Wheat Board. Since the election last year was of no assistance to the government they are now trying a different strategy. Apparently, it is now not too much trouble to close the pool accounts early. Again, the government thinks we are stupid.

There seems to be a lot of election talk around here.

**Mr. Lang:** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Korchinski:** I just have a few minutes and there are some other matters I want to remind the minister about.

For example, on January 22, 1969 I moved the adjournment of the House in order to discuss the shipping problem at Vancouver. Apparently in three years the minister has not learned very much. He does not apparently know that we have a winter or that we need to speed grain shipments. Although the minister talks about grain sales, how are we going to increase sales unless we can guarantee delivery? Knowing that we presently have a backlog of sales, no customer is going to consider purchasing more at the present time. The minister cannot tell me we are not losing sales simply because we cannot deliver.

During the past three years no plan has been formulated to deal with just such an emergency as this. We are getting into the same situation time and time again. In light of President Nixon's visit to China, I think we should go after all the sales we can since we do not know what will be the outcome of his visit. It may well be that the United States will cut into our sales to China, and it is possible we will have to go scrounging a lot harder for sales. Certainly, we derive no comfort from the minister's claims of increasing sales.

Under the minister's stabilization plan the farmers would have had to carry a deficit of \$10 million on their own shoulders. The government has an obligation to pay that \$10 million. After all, since we used to get \$2.12 a bushel for our wheat, anyone who thinks that as a result of the recent announcement the public will leap for the Liberals is just dreaming.

**Mr. Osler:** How much more wheat would you have sold, then?

**Mr. Korchinski:** Just let me illustrate to the minister what this payment is going to mean to the farmers. In the year 1959-60 there were 225,000 permit book holders in Canada and their acreage payments worked out to about \$190 each. Today those 225,000 producers would receive roughly \$240 each, in other words, an increase of about \$50 over a span of ten years.

Let me look at some comparisons. Our total budgetary expenditures in 1959 were \$5.3 billion. In 1960 they were \$5.7 billion. For this year they amount to \$13.1 billion. In other words, since there has been a 2.3 times increase in ten years, we should be paying 2.3 times as much as we paid our producers in 1960, which means they should be receiving \$440, not \$240. In other words, they are being short changed. Yet the government is trying to lead them into believing that they are getting a better deal. Although we have had a final payment of \$1.99 a bushel, last year we were down to \$1.60 and predictions for this year are that it will go even lower.

Let us examine the net income received by farm operators in the three prairie provinces. In 1960 they received \$640 million. In 1962 they received \$910 million. Then, after almost ten years of Liberal rule, in 1971 they received \$502 million, but there were 35,000 fewer farmers. Not much justice there, Mr. Speaker. With regard to total operating costs, from 1959 to 1963 the cost was \$683 million average. In 1971 it was \$1,147 million. Not much justice there, either.

In the few remaining minutes at my disposal I want to remind the House of a toast I once heard to justice. It went something like this: "Here's to justice in this fair