

based on the reduction of everything—the reduction of production, grain, cattle and even the number of farmers on the farm. They want to take 200,000 of our 430,000 farmers off the farm. That is their entire program. The minister knows that as well as I do. The minister knows as well as any prairie businessman that farming conditions are terrible and that prairie economic conditions are terrible. Farmers cannot pay debts, cannot sell produce and have produce piled up to the eaves, as I said before.

Speaking on an agricultural bill last night, the minister said as reported at page 5835 of *Hansard*:

I have been very disturbed by the tactics of some hon. members in connection with the legislation previously before the House. I was concerned that was some indication that they would hold up legislation without regard to the good of the farmers in western Canada.

He is not the only one who is disturbed; he is not the only one who is concerned. If he had listened to the speeches of hon. members on this side of the House, he would know why farmers are disturbed and concerned. We are disturbed as a result of the issue he himself raised. Although he suggests that there will be record sales of grain, the economy of the Prairies has not been at a lower ebb for years and years. I think the minister will admit this.

What is the trouble? I am not criticizing the minister personally. I only wish he would do what he is asking us to do, that is, listen. The minister may say that according to all indications our present grain exporting system is working to capacity and that we are losing sales because we cannot meet delivery requirements. He might go on to say that if we had another \$25 million of sales we could not make delivery.

Mr. Lang: That is not true.

Mr. McIntosh: The minister says that is not true. Ever since he has occupied this portfolio the minister has made excuses when we have criticized the government because grain has not been in position on the west coast, or because not enough grain has been in position. At one time it was too cold for the trains to haul the grain. Another time labour was to blame; there was a strike. In any event, the railways did not have the grain in position. There were always excuses. When reading the paper the other day I noticed that they are preparing us for another situation that may develop at the Lakehead. They are now saying that because of the late opening of the Great Lakes, they may not be able to make their promised deliveries during the shipping season.

Mr. Benjamin: God is at fault, too!

Mr. McIntosh: If our system is not adequate, let us start at the beginning and change it. What is the matter? The minister speaks of record sales, yet the economy of the Prairies is at its lowest ebb. Something is radically wrong. Let us all get together and not fight like this.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Canadian Wheat Board Act

Mr. McIntosh: The minister also told us that a great deal has been said by some farm leaders and people in politics which was most regrettable; these people had only caused fear among farmers who wanted to make a success of farming. It was the intention of the government to help them as much as possible by putting the system into the best possible shape. But he would surely give us on this side of the House, and the farm leaders of whom he was speaking, at least some credit for being disturbed about conditions on the Prairies, otherwise we would not be wasting our time standing up here talking to deaf ears.

The minister should analyse the position further. In a democracy there ought to be a free flow of information. One of the reasons we are standing up asking these questions is that the minister fails to answer them during the day to day question period. If he would look back on some of his answers he would see how political they were. Then he would not get up and make statements like the one I have mentioned. He is not endowed with any more gifts than the rest of us in this House, or than the leaders of farm organizations. He is not the only one who knows what is good for agriculture. Cannot he take advice? Apparently he is taking advice from the wrong people.

If I were in his place I would listen to what his Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said. What is participatory democracy? Are we to participate in it, or not? The first person who used that phrase, as I understand it, was Mao Tse-tung. Does the minister want us to follow that line of thinking? Is that what he is doing by trying to get 200,000 farmers off the land? Is he trying to establish complete control over production and everything else connected with the industry? Some of my friends think this is the case. In other words, he is going further to the left than some of those in the party sitting to my left. He is out-socializing the socialists, and that is hard to do.

This bill actually contains two distinct propositions. The first we shall not quarrel with. We are all in favour of protein grading and we give the minister full marks for bringing in the provisions dealing with this matter. But why was it necessary to include clauses making it possible to bring rapeseed, and so on, under the control of the Wheat Board? Was it to bait us? If so, he has succeeded, because every member on this side of the House who has spoken in the debate so far has criticized those provisions as unnecessary.

If protein grading is what our customers want, we can meet their requirements because we have some of the best protein graded wheat in the world. Had the minister confined the bill to those provisions, the measure would have gone through the House in an hour. But the minister had to make it a package deal. He puts a carrot in it, then he goes on the radio and blasts the farm leaders and the opposition for not going along with him.

Mr. Rose: He is a law professor.

Mr. McIntosh: Did they teach him everything about agriculture?

Mr. Rose: Lawyers are endowed with all the answers.