

Feed Grain

this as just another step toward turning the Canadian agricultural industry into a public utility.

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek): I am still waiting to hear how the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board is going to get around the new feed grain commission established in the province of Manitoba. In addition, it has just been announced that a feed grain commission is to be established in the province of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan gives as his reason that his board is going to regulate the federal government's feed grain program.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, we have waited some time for the minister responsible for the Wheat Board to make a statement of policy in the House and he has now done so. It has been obvious from his previous statements that this method of pricing is designed to subsidize the producers in the province of Quebec and the Maritimes at the expense of the grain producers of western Canada. It is designed to give an advantage to the livestock and poultry producers in the eastern provinces and to put the western producers of livestock at a disadvantage.

This is such an unfortunate policy it has forced two grain growing provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, to set up grain marketing agencies. This step should not have been necessary since we already have a very effective marketing agency. It destroys the effectiveness of the Canadian Wheat Board as the pricing agent in the domestic market, and puts in its place a very cumbersome pricing method that will not work well, will give trouble continually and give rise to political arguments in this House and elsewhere. It is an unfair policy for the farmers in the province of Ontario. I am surprised that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), who is a farmer in Ontario, has lent his support to a policy that is so biased, so cumbersome and in a great many respects unworkable. The pricing policy we had maintained an equality between the price of corn produced in Ontario and the price of feed grains produced in western Canada. It maintained a certain equilibrium which this new policy will destroy.

Finally, I am surprised that the minister, who represents a Saskatchewan constituency, has seen fit over the last several weeks to bring in policies that cause the western grain grower to subsidize the bread and flour industries in Canada, and now caps it off by formally bringing in this policy which will cause these farmers to subsidize the livestock producers of eastern Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to thank the minister for having followed what seems to become more and more the general rule in this House and having given to the spokesman for our party the French version of his statement.

Mr. Speaker, the problem referred to in the minister's statement is not new. In fact, we have been hearing for several years about the difference in prices between the east and the west.

[Mr. Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek).]

Because I am an optimist, I would like to repeat once more that before criticizing the policy announced today—and I would like this criticism to be as frank as possible—I believe that we should wait until we have tried the policy for a while.

For my part, I do not think that this policy is at all unfair to the western grain producers, any more than it is particularly to the advantage of those in the east.

In any event, I have always thought that the central government existed to adopt programs designed to bring justice to all areas of the land. And I am still convinced that all governments have endeavoured, in the past, to find a solution to that problem.

Of course, to my mind, it is too soon to pass a valid judgment on the plan proposed to us today. In any event, I trust the agriculture organization of the province of Quebec, the APU, will analyze this solution in depth, after which I am convinced its president will make an official statement and say with his usual frankness what he thinks of the policy.

Whatever the case may be, as the measure goes into force from September 15, that is tomorrow, I expect that in the very near future both eastern and western producers will be able to understand the full significance of this measure. If its effects are really good, the government will then have been justified in seeking a really fair solution, although it did take a long time to do so.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) wish to comment the minister's statement on motions?

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): No, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the hon. member for Joliette.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT TO OCTOBER 15—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion concerning a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the reasons which have led to the early convening of this House, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte):

That, when the House has passed Bill C-219, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, Bill C-220, An Act to amend the statute law providing for the payment of supplementary retirement benefits to certain persons in receipt of pensions payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and Bill C-223, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act, and the said bills have received Royal Assent, this House adjourn to October 15.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion moved by the hon. member. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such unanimous agreement?