

yields a little less than does Spring wheat, but further analysis indicates that in fact it tends to yield the same amount, approximately, on the same land. The statistical difference which appears when one looks at the broad yields seems to come from the fact that Durum tends to be grown in those areas where yields tend to be lower, rather than that the grain itself naturally yields less.

Obviously, to impose an artificially higher price for Durum, even in the domestic market, a very small market, it is true, might have had the result of encouraging more production of Durum, as compared to other wheat, than would have been the case. We felt that as we approached the floor, if we ever do, the two ought to be allowed to be in the relationship in which market forces place them.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Would the minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker? In view of the fact that the price of Durum has always been higher than for hard wheats, even sometimes as much as 25 cents higher, would the minister not agree that the floor for Durum should at least be somewhat higher than the floor for hard wheat? I agree that \$5.75 may be too high a spread. But should it not be somewhat higher than the \$3.25?

**Mr. Lang:** There have been periods during which Durum has been priced higher than other wheat, but this is not universally true; it has not always been the case. It may have reflected a particular number of special conditions. I think in the case of a floor price it would be very difficult to know the exact relationship which would be desirable. Of course, we have been looking at this question, recognizing that the greater proportion of both these crops is likely to be exported. Therefore, real market forces in the international world would likely adjust the price fairly appropriately between the two without our seeking to deal exactly with it. If we could come to any specific conclusions about the scientific reasons for the difference in price between the two, I would certainly be glad to take them into consideration when looking at the floor price for Durum.

The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre made a number of other suggestions with which I must take issue. He was grasping at straws, I think, Mr. Speaker, when he saw the two-price wheat system as having come about in the minority parliament situation of the last couple of years. I would have thought that at this point in the new session he would not want to refer back to this party's reliance on taking credit for everything that went on during the last parliament. He and his party tried that in the election campaign. The two-price system was, of course, begun in one form in 1969, the first year of the previous majority Liberal government; it was converted into \$3 two-price wheat in early 1972, in the last year of the majority parliament. That is when the most formal kind of two-price wheat was really born.

Of course, when a good program comes forward I suppose it is typical of politics that many people should try to take credit for it. Why, we even heard the hon. member for Crowfoot trying to claim it for the Conservative Party, going well back into history to do so, because the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), when he was prime minister, had made a couple of acreage payments. The hon. member called that two-price wheat,

in retrospect. Of course, these payment were coughed up from time to time, usually when an election was in prospect. This government intends to do things on a regular basis. The history of the right hon. gentleman and his government doing these things before an election is so implanted in the hon. member's mind that every time we introduce a good measure he expects an election to be around the corner. I suspect that some of the good things we shall be producing in the next few months will lead him to get ready for an election in 1975.

The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre should also go back and check his notes about the stabilization bill debate, because he suggested that I was in some way opposed to two-price wheat in connection with that debate. I was, of course, at that time in the very process of developing the two-price program which was implemented in January of 1972. What I said in the course of the stabilization bill debate, when his party and the official opposition obstructed in every possible way the movement into law of a good measure, was that this was good legislation which could be improved at a later date. I also said it should not be stopped simply because it was not the answer to all the problems.

I am delighted that all hon. members see the value of this bill. Some have suggested that the principle be extended to other grains. I will be glad to hear what they have to say about the specific levels they would regard as being right in the case of long-term arrangements for barley, for instance. If hon. members have any suggestions to put forward I would be delighted to receive them.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

\* \* \*

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**Mr. Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C-31, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1975.

#### THE ROYAL ASSENT

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** It is my duty to inform the House that I have received the following communication:

Government House  
Ottawa, October 30, 1974

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Right Honourable Bora Laskin, P.C., Administrator of the Government of Canada, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 30th day of October, at 5:45 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to a Bill.