

Canagrex

Mr. Mazankowski: Too many.

Mr. Kempling: You don't need any more.

Mr. Whelan: Crown corporations in provinces from which hon. members on all sides come have these same powers. I do not hear hon. members condemning them for having that kind of authority right in their own backyards, but they condemn me for wanting this little farm organization called Canagrex to do a certain job. Hon. members opposite should read the minutes of the Standing Committee on Agriculture. I was amazed today to hear about what a good job we are doing for agriculture. Mr. Speaker, you have been here long enough to have heard questions like "Why aren't you selling more?" Hon. members opposite have said that if it was not for wheat, we would have a great trade imbalance in Canada. Where are we selling all the other products? Hon. members opposite condemn the government and this minister when we try to do something to improve trade and assist entrepreneurs and private industry people so that they can compete with other countries in the world and have some kind of organization that assists them one way or another. Our people tell us continuously we cannot compete because we do not have the same guarantees and we do not have the same security.

Mr. Wise: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not want to interrupt the minister's speech because he was enjoying himself so much during its delivery. However, knowing the minister as I do, I am sure he would not want to leave any inaccuracies on the record or mislead the House. He made some reference to the rationalization of stabilization across the country. He knows that was on the agenda of the provincial ministers' conference in 1978, and it was also on the agenda in 1979 when I was minister. The minister indicated he had a financial commitment from the Treasury Board. He is absolutely correct. Where the inaccuracy occurred was in an indication that when I was minister I withdrew support. That is not correct. That is inaccurate. The minister knows there was no more support for that type of program in 1979 than there was in 1978. The people who were against that program were against it for the reasons the minister mentioned tonight. He is absolutely correct. In addition, only about two of the ten ministers representing the provinces supported the plan; thus the reason for the discontinuation of that program.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Is the minister rising on the same point of order, if it is a point of order?

Mr. Whelan: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think my memory is pretty good. I am going by the record. When the hon. member was minister I do not believe he shredded any of the decisions he made or the transcripts of any of the discussions in which he was involved. If I have read the record correctly, he was the minister of agriculture at the time it was decided to withdraw the program. According to the notes I have seen, the reason was the cost of the program. I will do some double-checking and, if I find that I am wrong, I will readily apologize.

Mr. G. M. Gurbin (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, I have only two or three minutes left to me, and in that short time I would like to make several points. I was prepared to make a very

reasoned and, I think, reasonable argument and comment on the bill before us tonight. It is very difficult to be reasonable following the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). We have been treated to another vintage ministerial outburst which would well qualify the minister for any acting award, but it had very little to do with the important issue before us and the serious concern we on this side of the House have about some of the measures proposed in this bill.

The first point which should be made is that although the minister did not refer to a "damned lie" because that would have been an unparliamentary thing to say, he did comment on 17 different associations—which are too numerous to mention in the short time I have—which have very serious concerns. They represented themselves in the news media in much the same way the minister often does, and brought forward a very reasoned position on the bill.

The second point I would like to make before calling it ten o'clock is that people who read *Hansard* or are watching today should be reminded of the comments of the minister in the House in response to the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) several days ago. The minister was responding to questions about promises he made regarding the prices of fuels and capital gains tax exemptions for farmers. He made promises to the agricultural community and to the Canadian public during the last election campaign. When responding to the hon. member for Vegreville, the minister said:

—I do not know what research the hon. member is using for all those statements that I made, because if he is reading speeches I gave during the election campaign, those were not prepared . . . They were made in the heat of debate, you could almost say off the cuff, but there isn't any cuff there!

One hon. member said:

What is on your shoes?

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

• (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House deemed to have been moved under Standing Order 40.

PENITENTIARIES—SHOWING OF PORNOGRAPHIC FILMS AND STAGING OF TOPLESS DANCING. (B) CORONER'S STATEMENT ON CYANIDE DEATHS

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, in the past few days the country has been shocked by newspaper accounts of what happened in the penitentiary at Archambault and the tragedy visited upon the families of some guards who worked there. What happened to the guards, and the long-term agony the families have to face as a result of what has happened to their loved ones who worked at the prison, is indeed a tragedy. What is also of concern is the question this tragedy raises in the minds of the public across Canada.