

Withholding of Grain Payments

recourse do we have? I can only make a speech. I cannot stomp across the floor of the chamber because Your Honour will call me to order. I am very capable of doing that, but of what value would it be?

There is only one thing wrong. The arrogance of this government is obvious through its actions. There is only one way for the people to react to that type of arrogance. The only appeal is the final appeal to the people. If the minister from Saskatchewan wants to be helpful, he should convince his cabinet colleagues of this. On his behalf I appeal to his cabinet colleagues to give him an opportunity to live up to the law. The minister is from Saskatchewan. He cannot do what the farmers of Saskatchewan have asked him to do, because of the Prime Minister and the rest of the cabinet.

What can we do in a situation like this? All we can do is appeal to the Prime Minister through speeches made in this House. I am very concerned. I feel sorry for the minister. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) is in the chamber. I know that he is just as concerned. What else can I do but say to the Prime Minister that he is not a dictator yet. The law is the law and, by God, he has to live up to it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Korchinski: Why can the Prime Minister disobey the law? He can do so simply because his supporters far outnumber those in the opposition. But why should we assume they will all vote in favour of this legislation? Are all the members over there yo-yos?

An hon. Member: What is a yo-yo?

Mr. Woolliams: They are puppets.

An hon. Member: Pulled by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Korchinski: Since when has any minister the right to assume that every member of the party supporting him will in fact continue to do so? I remind Your Honour that it was once necessary to hold an election on the basis of one vote cast by a member of this House who reversed his position with regard to a particular issue. That is part of Canadian history. Why should we expect these members to be dum-dums, yo-yos, or whatever people want to call them? Are they yo-yos, or are they dum-dums? They are nobodies when they get 50 yards from the House, as the Prime Minister once told them. We accept that proposition.

In this Parliament there are 26 ministers, but the Minister of Agriculture cannot get his way because one almighty Caesar does not wish it. There is no way in which I can be convinced that even the cabinet has the right to flout the law. I raised this question early in September but it was shrugged off on that occasion. I do not feel slighted. I think it is a very good issue. I believed at that time it was important, and I couldn't care less whether it came up on that occasion or almost a month later. The issue is an important one, far more important than the \$60 million due to the western producers although, by God, we could use the money. What is the use of voting one way or another on any measure if somebody in the administration can decide whether to live up to the law or

not? The Prime Minister has been accused of being a dictator.

An hon. Member: By whom?

Mr. Korchinski: It is not as simple as that. But now we have positive proof. Because we in western Canada are smaller in number we are treated without the slightest consideration. The Minister of Agriculture just sits there and grins. If I were in the cabinet, if I were minister responsible for the Wheat Board, knowing that the law was in existence I would feel obliged to make this payment. So what about it? Let hon. members over there tell me they are not obliged to make the payment. I say to the minister, "Pay the \$60 million for last year and we shall forget the interest on that amount. We shall forget the two months after that". From that point on, if the minister wants to stabilize farm income let him come through with a plan. I believe the minister is a reasonable man. I have had occasion to deal with him. I believe he wants to work it that way.

Mr. Haidasz: Why criticize him, then?

Mr. Korchinski: I wish you were in the cabinet. I believe you are also reasonable. You should be in the cabinet.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member address his remarks to the Chair. Perhaps his use of "you" was rhetorical. However, the hon. member should address the Chair.

Mr. Korchinski: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I was carried away. But I am as adamant as I was before. There is only one thing left for the minister to do, that is to appeal to his colleagues in the cabinet to allow the payment of the \$60 million which was due last year. We have already lost one year. He could then go through with his stabilization bill. We have given evidence of our co-operation, our willingness to help the minister along with his legislation.

The government has the right to introduce and amend legislation, but it certainly has no right to flout the law. If the government insists on taking its present course I would point out that everyone will have the right to go the wrong way on a one-way street. Everybody would have the right to abuse the laws of the country, the executive having already done so. To whom can one appeal, if not to the highest level, that is, to the cabinet itself? They will not tell me for one moment that I have the right to refuse to pay income tax.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I apologize to the hon. member but I would bring to the notice of the House the fact that he has about a minute and a half left. Perhaps the hon. member could finish his remarks with the consent of the House, it now being six o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Korchinski: I shall not labour the point. If the executive has the right to break the law, I invite everybody in this country to break the law, which I suggest is a bad thing. If that is what the government wants, they are encouraging it by this type of legislation.

At six o'clock the House took recess.