

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member might be allowed to ask his question and the minister respond to it, after which I will attempt to call orders of the day.

**Mr. Higson:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Transport state whether construction of an airport is being considered by his department for the Niagara peninsula, specifically in the township of West Lincoln, as an alternative site to the proposed Pickering airport or to replace the present Mount Hope airport outside of Hamilton?

● (1500)

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think it can be as a substitute to the Pickering or Mount Hope airport.

\* \* \*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the House leader will outline the business for the next few days in the usual Thursday manner?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I propose to call second reading of the Customs Act followed by the Aircraft Registry Act, the National Parks Act, the Co-operative Credit Associations Act and on Monday, regardless of how many of those items we have cleared up on Friday, we will definitely begin the report stage of the Foreign Investment Review Act.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the House leader when we might debate the resolution in respect of our contingent to the UN peacekeeping force in the mid-east?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, following the visit of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to New York.

**Mr. Stanfield:** When is that?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Tomorrow. We will decide early in the week when to call the resolution, but on Monday we will definitely begin with the Foreign Investment Review Act, and at that time we will discuss when to call the resolution on the Middle East.

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As has been done before on allotted days, may I suggest that the first four speeches by one member from each party be limited to 20 minutes and that the remaining speeches be limited to 15 minutes with no extra time. This could perhaps be made an order, as I understand there is some agreement. I would also hope that later this evening we may, in the normal way, reduce the time of speeches in view of the ministerial statement which will interrupt the proceedings.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** We agree, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

**Mr. Fortin:** We agree, Mr. Speaker.

## Agriculture

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. members have heard the suggestion made by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell). Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

#### ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—STATE OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY UNDER GOVERNMENT POLICIES

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot)** moved:

That this House deplores the government's inability to give leadership in developing and implementing comprehensive and co-ordinated agricultural policies and programs and regrets that by ill-advised and ad hoc remedies the government has weakened the over-all agricultural economy.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in putting forward this motion I feel that you and the House should be made aware of some of the chaotic conditions that exist in agriculture today. Many people in Canada feel that the agricultural economy has had a good year and is basically very sound. However good a year it has been is in spite of the government's policies, certainly not because of them.

We have had a package of short-term and harsh adjustments to the agricultural economy over the past year. They were short term because the government was running a few scant steps ahead of the demands of the consumer. These harsh actions taken by the government brought about a short-term solution but in the long run will severely hurt the consumer as they will tend to bring about greater scarcity and higher prices in the following year.

What actually have we seen? We have seen established in Canada a host of what might be termed arbitrary prices. Prices have been arrived at in the grain industry in an arbitrary manner as well as prices in the livestock industry. This is certainly true, as has been pointed out quite vividly in an editorial that appeared in the October issue of *Country Guide*. Let me quote briefly from that magazine:

Governments can impose arbitrary pricing methods but, when mistakes are made by those doing the pricing, the farmer must pay for them. Worse still, arbitrary pricing can keep producers in the dark about market demand and prices, isolate them from the market and leave them with little choice but to devote more of their time to fighting political battles rather than managing their farms.

That certainly has been the case this past year. In any farm publication you pick up, be it the *Western Producer*, the *Winnipeg Free Press* or the *Manitoba Co-operator*, you will find the question asked, what is the price of this commodity and what is the effect of government policy going to be? An editorial in the *Manitoba Co-operator* of October 25 deals with six possible prices for barley in that province and suggests that the farmer is wondering what price he can expect to receive on the market for his grain.