

Supplementary Estimates

The writer adds that according to the pamphlet he received from the ministry, the program is to be backed by on-the-farm inspection. This, he says, will entail the employment of thousands of administrators and the cost of such policing will be exorbitant. I raise this question: Will the Manpower offices be called upon to supply these inspectors, or will we use the same old political patronage system as in the past?

I wish the minister would tell us what to do. It was suggested by some officials with whom I met recently that application should be made to the branch administering PFA. I say to the minister that there would be so many applications that it would be necessary for him to reinforce the PFA staff immediately. Local people are quite capable of carrying out farm inspections. I hope he will not continue to use the old system whereby the only qualification needed was the approval of the local Liberal organization. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that there are not too many Liberals left in this area, and those who are left will probably not be qualified to say who is, and who is not, fit to inspect.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I understand an hon. member wishes to ask a question.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member a question. I have heard him speak about farming as a way of life, and I agree with part of what he has said. But is he suggesting that this way of life should be subsidized?

Mr. Korchinski: I am saying that these people were told by government economists that they ought to expand, borrow from the Farm Credit Corporation and make their production efficient by using modern methods and machinery. So in a sense we are no longer talking about family farms but about economic units, if we want to be impersonal. Over the years the people have tried to make profitable units out of their holdings. Many farmers, in addition to growing corn—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him under the rules has expired.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, under the unusual procedure we are following today in connection with the supply of certain sums of money to Her Majesty, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) has been able to smirk quietly in

[Mr. Korchinski.]

his seat all through this debate, wearing the traditional expression of the cat that swallowed the canary.

I suppose he is happy about the situation in which he finds himself, but I should like to have been close enough to the hon. gentleman to see the whites of his eyes across the aisle between us. While he has been getting off scot-free, his hon. friend from Saskatoon has been bearing the brunt, if not quite all of the onslaught from this side of the chamber. For most of the day we have been discussing the production of wheat, or measures to prevent it being produced. I think, to speak in Biblical terms, that along with these loaves of wheat there should be some fishes.

The subject to which I should like to address my comments has to do with items in the estimates which affect the fishing industry, which may come as a relief to the minister from Saskatoon. Out of the \$250 million provided in the supplementary estimates, the amounts under the heading "Fisheries and Forestry" are relatively modest. I find myself intrigued by them.

● (8:50 p.m.)

Over recent weeks the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) has been making announcements of certain payments that were going to be made, arising in some cases out of emergency situations such as the loss to the fishermen because of contamination in the Placentia Bay area of Newfoundland. There is an item of \$182,000 to cover the cost of this, representing a grant to the universities for assistance to educational work in fisheries. Then there is an item—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. I realize that he is just starting his speech and that the remarks he is making are introductory in nature. But if I remember well, earlier today a suggestion was made by the Chair that until we were in Committee of the Whole there should be no detailed discussion of items in the estimates, and as much as possible we should limit contributions to this debate to the principle, if there is a principle, of the bill before us.

I think it would not be in order to refer to individual items and to consider or debate them except in a very general way. I appreciate that the hon. member knows this just as well as I do, and I hope he will keep it in the back of his mind during his speech.

Mr. Barnett: I appreciate the point Your Honour has raised, and I assure you that I am