

Market is having difficulty trying to control production. Possibly the European Market is based on the same idea that the present government has, namely, the control of the industry. I am told it is not what you know about agriculture, but who you know and whether you can get a licence. I hope it does not come to that, but I am afraid it might.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIntosh: There will be more said about this matter in a few moments. All the legislation which this government is bringing forth on behalf of the agricultural industry points toward that type of trend—control, control, control. Canadians are asking the purpose of this. Is this participatory democracy? If so, we do not want it.

Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin): We agree with the need for cash advances at this time, Mr. Speaker, and admit that the climate in which producers operate is far from ideal. If this were not so, there would not be any need for cash advances. I remember the good old days when the farmer's produce could be sold. When a producer is forced to accept cash advances because he has no other way of obtaining cash, he is put in a position of being in debt to the government. With these amendments, this will be done at an increased rate of interest. I am sure it is rather frightening to the producers to realize that they are becoming more and more dependent upon the government as well as more in debt. This seems to be in line with the government's take-over policy, its desire to get control of this industry and to take over the land. This is something which must be watched in the future.

When discussing farm legislation in Canada we are always at a disadvantage when we realize one fact. This was ably pointed out by my colleague, the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey). The fact is that this government is niggardly in its policy of assisting agriculture in comparison with governments of other countries with which our producers must compete on the world market.

I have some interesting DBS figures respecting the grain growing provinces of Canada. If Your Honour will bear with me, I will quote the figures for the three Prairie provinces. Farm cash receipts from farming operations in Manitoba dropped from \$351 million plus in 1969 to \$336 million plus in 1970. In Saskatchewan, farm cash receipts dropped from \$709,703,000 in 1969 to \$690,996,000 in 1970. In Alberta, they dropped from \$727,471,000 in 1969 to \$694,104,000 in 1970. These are the total farm cash receipts for those provinces. They are very significant figures.

I would like to comment on the point made by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) concerning the regulations for any government program. I emphasize the fact that the regulations sent out to farmers with regard to the Lift program were not clearly understood. If they were clear, they were not understood. In fact, they were misunderstood to the extent that there was confusion and a resultant loss of income.

In the former legislation, specific advances of \$1 a bushel for wheat, 40 cents for oats and 70 cents for

Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act

barley were allowed. This is no longer the case. This bill contributes to the government's argument for having rye, rapeseed and flaxseed under the Wheat Board. I wish to read the following passage from the May 1 edition of the *Free Press Weekly*:

Canadian-Wheat Board Minister Otto Lang put his head on the chopping block of prairie farm opinion last week by introducing a Commons amendment that could give the board marketing control of flax, rye and rapeseed.

If it became law, the proposed amendment to the Wheat Board Act would give Ottawa order in council power to lump flax, rye and rapeseed together with the three grains the CWB now controls, namely wheat, barley and oats.

Despite Mr. Lang's statement that no such permissive legislative provision would be implemented without "thorough discussion" between the federal government and those affected by a possible changed status of flax, rye and rapeseed, the prairie grain trade—and especially rapeseed grower groups—made their opposition crystal clear.

It is interesting to note what was said by a former member of this House, the former member for Assiniboia who was a grain farmer and quite knowledgeable on these matters. I quote from page 3403 of *Hansard* of February 15:

If farmers themselves were making decisions about the level of initial payments, it might be defensible to suggest that they be held responsible for any consequent losses; but since the Wheat Board is not a producer-controlled board the government should continue to stand behind the initial prices they set.

Clause 7 of this bill has removed the statutory amount that the government may advance to farmers for their crops. In his speech yesterday the minister stated that listing the amount available for a cash advance would tend to encourage certain production. By not having anything listed or available, the farmer is left in the dark about what to plant this spring. It has been my experience that if you take the advice of the government through the Department of Agriculture you can be in more trouble than if you had not heard the advice in the first place.

These changes are hard on the small farmer. We might say, "What else is new?" First, there is an increased rate of interest. There is no guidance as to what to grow. As I have said, we might be better off if we did not know. It is also possible that prairie farm assistance will be withdrawn. All of this discourages farmers from becoming flexible and at the same time seems to make the powers of the government more flexible. It all seems to be aimed at the removal, even the eradication, of the small family farm in this country.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, as I view this piece of legislation I consider it to be part of the government's grand design to take absolute control of the agricultural industry. It is merely one part of several legislative items, the most important of which is probably Bill C-176, also before the House at the present time. There is also legislation dealing with the stabilization of incomes in the western agricultural economy, and legislation proposing the expansion of control of the Canadian Wheat Board over rye, rapeseed and flaxseed. As far as I