

ined closely. Perhaps this should be in the form of a subsidy to the farmer rather than the consumer.

•⁽²²¹⁰⁾
 What is needed in Canada is a policy that would give jurisdiction to the Canadian Wheat Board over all grains marketed in western Canada, no matter where they are sold, and extending this jurisdiction to all grains including rapeseed, flax and rye, and perhaps in addition eastern Canadian grain. This would cover grains sold on the export market as well as the domestic market, interprovincially as well as intraprovincially. Such a policy would provide for a balance between livestock and grain producers in all regions of Canada. A fair price would be determined that would balance the needs of eastern grain growers and eastern feeders with their western counterparts. I suggest this is the only solution to the problem. The status quo is no longer suitable.

We realize there must be an over-all national policy in respect of grain. We must move into a new era that will be fair to all Canadian farmers no matter where they live, and which will balance the needs of grain and livestock producers. The only workable alternative is one that will place our grains under Canadian Wheat Board control. If we revert back to more of an open market system, or the so-called free trade market system, it could mean chaos and financial ruin for Canadian farmers at the hands of manipulators. Furthermore, there is some concern in western Canada about the attempt by certain interests to get rid of the Crowsnest Pass rates. At a meeting of the Standing Committee on Agriculture when it heard representatives of the Canadian Grains Council on Tuesday, July 10, 1973, Dr. Dever stated in respect of Crowsnest rates:

At the same time, because these rates may be uneconomic, we have trouble getting—

The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) interjected as follows:

Excuse me, which rates are uneconomic?

Doctor Dever indicated he was referring to the Crowsnest Pass rates and said they were uneconomic because of the cost figures provided for them under the National Transportation Act. So it seems to me that there is a movement afoot at the present time to get rid of the Crowsnest pass rates. I feel also that this is another sacred principle that has to be adhered to and these rates must be maintained. We must remember, going back in history, that the railroad companies of Canada received extensive concessions from the federal government in the form of land and mineral rights in certain locations of the country. Even though reference is made to the unprofitability of the railroads, the profits these other endeavours make must be included before any determination is made as to whether or not the operations of the railroads are profitable.

I suggest, therefore, that a feed grains policy must be produced within the context of a national grains policy and such a national grains policy must adopt certain principles or ideas as follows. There should be a price for the product which will return to the producer the cost of production plus a reasonable profit on his investment, management and labour. For too many years farmers have been working by the sweat of their brow without reasonable return. We must have efficient and low-cost service in

Feed Grains

the production and handling of farm products. Such a policy must adopt selective price controls on the inputs of grain production in order that increased cash flow is not unjustly siphoned off by rapidly escalating input costs imposed by agribusiness firms as they administer managed prices, as evidenced by the cost of fertilizer this spring.

There must be stability of price and maximum market opportunities through the functioning of a sympathetic and orderly marketing system. Incidentally, one farmer told me that the fuel bill on his farm operation rose by at least \$400 this spring because of the increase in the price of diesel fuel and gasoline. We must have a rail transportation system with the capability of delivering a growing volume of grain domestically or to export positions on an uninterrupted basis at the least cost to the farmer. We must adopt a grain handling system which has the capability of servicing the farm at the least cost yet meet the increasing volume of throughput required to service modern transportation facilities in both country elevator systems and at coast port or lake terminals. I have in mind facilities at Prince Rupert and Churchill.

I am told I have only one minute left, so I shall try to conclude my remarks. We must have a policy that provides adequate levels of inventory on a continuously expanding basis to meet domestic, human, livestock and poultry requirements in keeping with constant growth requirements everywhere in Canada from Bonavista to Vancouver Island. We must also have a policy which will allow Canadian farmers access to world markets in spite of artificial barriers created by other exporting countries—I have in mind tariffs, domestic or export subsidies and import levies—while at the same time returning to the Canadian grain grower adequate prices and income for his production.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Nesdoly) has made some excellent suggestions which embody fine principles. However, we are faced with the problem of how to implement them. We must decide upon the machinery to implement some of his more reasonable suggestions in a program or legislative context. I must say that there is a degree of hypocrisy in this motion in that the NDP has moved the motion under Standing Order 26, knowing full well it will not come to a vote and that it has no legal sanction so far as the government is concerned. This government is in power today because hon. members to my left have kept it in power. Anything this government does which is inequitable and does not meet the situation is done because the government has been kept in power by those hon. members. They cannot deny that fact.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Who supported the corporate tax cuts?

Mr. Baldwin: While we have heard some reasonable comments from hon. members in that area of the House, there is a certain degree of hypocrisy about this motion. At least hon. members in the Social Credit party have on occasion had enough gumption to vote against the government, and for that reason they are entitled to be heard. I suggest they speak with a great deal more credibility than hon. members in the social NDP. Those hon. members to