

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Bigg
Blackburn
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Douglas
Gleave
Harding
Horner
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lewis

MacInnis (Mrs.)
McIntosh
Mather
Nystrom
Rowland
Saltsman
Schumacher
Skoberg
Thomson
(Battleford-Kindersley)
Winch—21.

NAYS

Messrs:

Alexander
Allmand
Andras
Badanai
Baldwin
Barrett
Basford
Beer
Bell
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Cafik
Carter
Chrétien
Clermont
Coates
Comtois
Corriveau
Crouse
Cullen
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
Dinsdale
Downey
Faulkner
Forget
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gibson
Gillespie
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Hales
Harkness
Hogarth
Hopkins
Howard
(Okanagan Boundary)
Howe
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Lachance

Laing
(Vancouver South)
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Lang (Saskatoon-
Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Lefebvre
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard
(Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lundrigan
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Cape
Breton-East Richmond)
Mackasey
MacKay
MacLean
Macquarrie
McBride
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIlraith
McKinley
McNulty
McQuaid
Mahoney
Major
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
Monteith
Morison
Muir
Nielsen
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Paproski
Perrault
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Ritchie
Roberts

Rock
Rodrigue
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Sharp
Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury

Stanfield
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart
(Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Trudeau
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Walker
Whelan
Whiting—118

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): In rising to speak to the amendment to the motion moved by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) I wish to state that I will support the amendment and the motion to amend Bill C-244.

I might first of all agree with the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) who stated emphatically that it was his impression there was an agreement between the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board and the agriculture ministers of the three prairie provinces. It was obviously clear on October 1, because, as reported under the heading "Business of the House" at page 8368 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) had this to say:

Yesterday the government House leader announced that Monday's business would be Bill C-244. I think everyone in this House knows that discussions are taking place between the federal Minister of Agriculture and the agriculture ministers of the western provinces. I wish to report to the House—and I have so advised the House leaders opposite—that these discussions may continue. In that case, rather than call the agriculture bill on Monday we will continue with the measure now before the House. The House leader will endeavour to notify opposition House leaders as early as possible on Monday.

This gives one some idea that there was an agreement. It is regrettable that agreements mean nothing to the federal government, that agreements mean nothing now to federal ministers. I used to think this only applied to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) when he reneged on the agreement he made with the cattle producers of western Canada, but we now see the minister in charge of the Wheat Board disregarding the agreement he made with the three agriculture ministers of western Canada.

Mr. Lang: Nonsense.

Mr. Horner: This gives us some concept of the wording of the present bill. Can the country go along placing faith and trust in the word of a government one cannot really trust very much? When that situation becomes an established fact, it is wise for the government, I suppose, to call an election so that the public can restate its confidence in them or choose another government.

The formula presented to us takes 1970 as the base year, as the year to which costs of production should be related. In order to gauge that year as the foundation year for the establishment of net farm income as a basis for a stabilization program, one has to establish the net farm income position. As the bill now stands, it is really an insurance concerned with marketing the grain. It is not an insurance of the farmers' ability to produce or sell. It is a guarantee for a marketing system toward which farmers are asked to contribute a 2 per cent levy. Has that system worked?