

Supply

pared to see a fair and workable agricultural arrangement between the various regions of Canada.

• (1720)

I want to say, too, Mr. Chairman, that we are concerned about the Wheat Board's handling of grain, particularly about the present situation that exists in western Canada and most particularly in the province of Saskatchewan and in my constituency, in regard to the marketing of rapeseed. I am informed that some farmers are delivering rapeseed under contract for less than the current market price. At some points in my constituency grain companies are paying 30 cents to 35 cents a bushel more than at other points in the same constituency. Places like Kinley, where the higher prices are paid, are plugged and farmers at that point are not able to deliver the quantities of wheat that they should under their quota because other farmers 50 or 60 miles east are delivering grain so that they can get the Vancouver price.

Two or three years ago I said to the then minister in charge of the Wheat Board that two future markets operating in western Canada could only work to the disadvantage of the western farmer, and this is what has happened. The only reasonable solution to the problem is to bring these other non-board grains under the Canadian Wheat Board and have an efficient method of marketing and pricing. The quota regulations are working to the disadvantage of the ordinary producers of rapeseed because of the present price situation and an explanation is owed to them. They should not have to spend their time in a truck taking their grain to another area in order to get the higher price; it should be available to them at their own elevator door. Perhaps the minister can clear up this problem when he speaks about the production and marketing of feed grains.

The price of rapeseed and the method of marketing will have a very important effect on planting programs in the coming year. The method of pricing barley will also have a profound effect on the plans of farmers in the coming year. There is nothing in the actions of the government to suggest that they have given any serious consideration to these factors. The minister makes vague noises now and then about bringing other grains under the Wheat Board, but in the last parliament when he and his party had a chance to do this they voted against it. When the Conservatives had a chance to do it, they also voted against it.

It would be interesting, Mr. Chairman, if the Conservatives would state their policy in regard to marketing. Do they want a free-wheeling, open market for feed grains and rapeseed across Canada or do they want them marketed through the Wheat Board, giving a fair deal to those who buy and those who sell? I am offering the Conservatives the same challenge on grain marketing that my leader offered them on the pension program half an hour ago. When are they going to stand up and be counted? I will put the policy of our party on the line. We will not continue to put up with the present policies in regard to rapeseed which set producer against producer and farmer against farmer to the advantage of that group who handles it and skims off the profit as the farmer moves it from the field to the marketplace.

[Mr. Gleave.]

We will have a chance to talk on the method of movement of grain later as these estimates move through the Committee, but at this point I should like to deal again with the needs of the men and women and their families in the Peace River country. We need to do more for them because we should not see hardship visited on farm families in Canada without protest. As a final word, Mr. Chairman, I say again to the Minister of Agriculture that he should review his position. He should personally walk with those farmers in their fields and talk to them. After he has done that, he is entitled to make his decision and bring it before the House. He should come here and tell the House what he has seen, then make recommendations on what should be done to meet the situation.

• (1730)

[Translation]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say a few words on the supplementary estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

I attentively listened a while ago to the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) who spoke about agriculture. That member is surely well versed in agriculture, but as many others he does not know all solutions to farming problems.

The hon. member stated that we should find means to stimulate production in Canada, but I wonder whether it would now be advisable to stimulate farming production. Not so long ago, various ways were found to prevent farmers from producing apparently because there were surpluses. Eastern farmers were penalized because they were producing too much while western farmers were paid to prevent them from sowing.

Now, we are told that agriculture has to be invigorated and this, after it has been restricted and mismanaged to a point that about 50 per cent of our farmers are giving it up. A new policy of incentives for agriculture is now being advocated. But I do not think that agriculture can be stimulated with the means we have now. In fact, when a farmer needs machinery, he pays a lot for it, what with taxes and transportation. He also has to pay a very high rate of interest to finance companies when purchasing his implements.

But farmers do need other things besides machinery, like materials, buildings and decent homes. And when purchasing building materials, they must pay an 11 per cent tax just like any other citizen.

And yet we want the price of farm products to go down because the cost of living is too high, and we are seeking ways of bringing it down. Well, bringing the cost of living down for the farmers is a simple matter of removing taxes, bringing down interest rates and granting compensated discounts on products. In fact, the primary incentive for farmers is to enable them to sell their products, which is only possible if citizens have adequate purchasing power.

Now the cost of food is so high that many families are denying themselves necessary food products. I shall give milk as an example: some families could use four or five quarts a day but use only one because they cannot afford to buy more. The government should therefore find a