

Mr. Lamontagne: From what I know of the judgment of the judge in this case, I do not think he blames the Post Office; he just questions whether perhaps better information could be given on the limits of insured mail and the responsibility we have in these cases, that is all.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

DECISION OF ALBERTA TURKEY PRODUCERS TO WITHDRAW FROM NATIONAL PLAN—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. It is prompted by the recent decision of the Alberta turkey producers to withdraw from the national plan. The decision was taken not particularly by choice but, rather, by necessity.

The minister has been warned about this problem over the last 12 months and he knows that a similar problem exists in the other national agencies. I want to ask what action he intends to take in the near future to overcome this difficulty and similar difficulties which exist in three or four of the national marketing plans.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member speaks as if it were my fault that the Alberta turkey producers have decided to withdraw from the national plan. It is written right into the agreement which they have signed that if they give one year's notice, they can withdraw. They want to be self-sufficient in turkeys in Alberta. They want a larger share of the national market for turkeys in Alberta.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whelan: According to the plan, they shall share, in a true Canadian attitude, in the total national production of turkeys. They say that because the population in Alberta has increased, they should have more of the turkey production. That is not in accordance with the terms of the agreement which they signed.

● (1500)

Mr. Wise: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is addressed to the same minister. He should recognize that the continued success of these national marketing plans depends upon the ability of the producers within each province to take advantage of some of the changing and increasing marketing conditions within the provinces. Under the present regulation, which is within the minister's responsibility, this is simply impossible. I simply ask the minister if he will accept his responsibility and call a meeting in the very near future of his provincial counterparts and other people within the agricultural industry in an attempt to resolve these difficulties before all the national plans in this country go down the drain.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, none of the national plans will go down the drain unless the producers themselves make the

Business of the House

decision, because they are the ones who agree among themselves how the quotas shall be shared. I do not tell them what they should do with what parts of the quotas; they decide among themselves how they shall be shared. If one province cannot convince the other nine provinces how they shall be shared, it has that alternative of withdrawing from the plan. If they want to discard a plan they will be on the road to self-destruction. It will not be the result of what I do, but of what they do unto themselves.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the government House leader whether he can designate the business we will be covering in the next little while? I draw his attention to the answer to the question about House business yesterday in which he indicated he might be able to go further than perhaps a day or so. If in the course of his answer he could perhaps designate next Tuesday as an allotted day, I would be grateful.

May I thank him for the draft of the motion in respect of the reference of the various estimates to several standing committees of the House. If he can assure me that it is in the usual form I would be quite prepared to indicate that it would be appropriate for him to call that tomorrow.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to designate next Tuesday as an allotted day. My understanding is that the reference of the estimates to the several standing committees is the traditional reference that is familiar to the House.

With regard to the business tomorrow, we will be continuing our debate on the amendment to the National Housing Act, followed by the resumed debate on second reading of the energy bill. I would like then, of course, for members to keep in mind the possibility of dealing with the bill amending the Judges Act. It is not an item that should provoke prolonged discussion. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lalonde) is also interested in the possibility of dealing with a particular amendment to the Criminal Code that might be broken out of the larger bill and presented to the House.

I would also at some point like to call Bill S-6 which has come from the Senate. Of course, hon. members may keep in mind that we still have the budget bill and the excise tax bill which are very much in my mind.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend and I have talked periodically about the commodity tax review and the reference of that to the appropriate standing committee. Given the representations in the document that he and I discussed yesterday in the House, is he prepared to indicate today that he will put down the appropriate reference so it can be dealt with, on the assurance that he would be prepared to refer it to the committee without debate?