hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) was speaking a short while ago. It seems that he is somewhat ashamed of the legislation he has to bring before the House. He is ashamed of the legislation because he is unable to answer the questions which the agricultural producers across this nation are now asking.

After looking at the minister's press release of May 7, it would appear that if anyone is playing politics it is the minister. I suggest it is cheap politics that the minister is playing. When one becomes as touchy as the minister, there is a basis for this type of reference. In his May 7 press release, he refers to a so-called filibuster in the House which is working against the interests of all the Western farmers. Those involved in agricultural production are concerned that there may be some cheap politics used in this House to ram through legislation that in the long run is not in the best interests of the agricultural industry.

It amazes me that we are unable to divide the two factors in this bill, one of which is the $100 million figure which the government throws around as the amount that will be passed to the farmer. In his press release, the minister stated:

> As long as these members continue to be more interested in making political hay in the House of Commons than in helping the prairie farmers reap the benefits of new legislation, the House cannot turn its attention to the huge backlog of other legislation which must be dealt with.

I suggest that it is only the members of the opposition who are interested in the agricultural economy. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who has today assumed the new name "Jack in the box", is not concerned about what really happens to the agricultural producers in western Canada. It appears that after being given two portfolios, manpower and immigration as well as responsibility for the Canadian Wheat Board, the minister is not interested in trying to serve one or the other or he would say that he cannot handle both of these portfolios. Both are areas of great concern to the people of this country. If he was consistent and responsible, the minister would indicate to the Prime Minister that he cannot handle these two portfolios. Since he has to handle both portfolios, no doubt it is the bureaucrats in the department who are really calling the shots.

I like to think that the minister is concerned about the agricultural economy. When I read the minister's recent news release, I wondered whether the minister was saying it was just too bad, he had to ram through this legislation which does not mean anything to anyone, particularly the agricultural producers, because they do not understand it. As I said the other day, the minister was not on very good terms with the premier of Saskatchewan. He must have returned to the good graces of that premier a short while ago. In the address he made at Morse, the premier of Saskatchewan said he did not want to tip his hand on when an election would be held but he added, and I quote:

> It would be very nice to have those cheques in the hands of farmers before an election.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

I suggest that the premier of Saskatchewan and the minister are in cahoots in order to try to ram through a provision, the application of which the average producer is not aware. I am sure all members appreciate the fact that we must plan if we expect this nation to grow. At the same time, there is more to planning than philosophizing about what should be done for the agricultural industry. Not too long ago the Prime Minister was interviewed about what he considered to be the real problems of agriculture. At that time he said, and I quote:

> Perhaps, to be quite candid with you, when you talk of growing disenchantment I must begin by saying that some of my reading of the west is that it is always disenchanted.

This is a typical example of the interest of the Prime Minister and his cabinet in the agricultural economy of the west. They give zero consideration to that particular area of our country. It is time we realized that this government does not care one iota about what happens to the agricultural economy. Later in the interview the Prime Minister said:

> If this is the case, it is not so much a question of meeting the disenchantment by specific things, but by convincing the west that the way to beat this alienation is to get in there and fight.

The Prime Minister is suggesting that the farmers get in there and fight for what is rightfully theirs. The minister, members of the cabinet and members opposite are saying that we are trying to filibuster a bill which is not in the interests of the agriculture industry at this time. In the same interview, the Prime Minister said:

> This is exactly what we did in Quebec. I am speaking now as a Quebecker and a French-Canadian. There was a great disenchantment with Ottawa in Quebec. It was leading to the breakup of the country.

I believe this interview took place before the so-called apprehended insurrection in Quebec. At that time the Prime Minister thought he had Quebec in the palm of his hand and could do exactly what he wanted. If the Prime Minister now believes he has any part of Canada in the palm of his hand, he better take another look because that is definitely not the situation.

May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin)—Industry—Aid programs for footwear industry.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions.