

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

in partnership but that the Wheat Board will only allow them one permit book. I ask, what will be the position of the corporation and of the co-operative? I am speaking of the sort of corporation in Manitoba and Alberta in which a father and two or three sons jointly operate a farm. There is no provision in this bill for them and I can foresee considerable difficulties. I do not know if the minister has something in the works to look after these things. He did not say he had when he spoke but then, of course, he referred to the more attractive parts, if there are attractive parts, of this program.

An hon. Member: There are attractive parts.

Mr. Gleave: Does the hon. member think so? I want to tell the hon. member something, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: It's about time.

Mr. Gleave: If the people of Canada were paying what they should be paying for wheat produced in western Canada, which is at least another \$1 a bushel, we could put as much money into this program every year as the government is proposing to put into it, and even more. We could do that if we were paid for our wheat what we ought to be paid. We could put more into the program. A *Winnipeg Tribune* story says—and the minister may deny it—that the minister was in favour of establishing higher prices for wheat sold domestically in Canada.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? Has the hon. member read clause 32(4) which provides that in the special case where a couple of producers or more farm together under one permit book, a bigger share is to be allowed them.

Mr. Gleave: If the government is to do that, that will be helpful.

Mr. Osler: It is in the bill.

Mr. Gleave: That is good.

Mr. Osler: The bill the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. Gleave: Thank you.

Mr. Osler: That is to be found at page 19, beginning at line 10.

Mr. Gleave: There will be more problems if—

Mr. Osler: It is there in English and in French.

An hon. Member: He can read neither language.

● (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I think it would be helpful if hon. members engaging in the debate would direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker, I try to be as courteous as possible. The minister wanted to draw attention to something in the bill which I had overlooked and I appreciate his doing so.

I will get back to the point I was making. This approach overlooks many of the practical things which

[Mr. Gleave.]

could have been done to meet the need which exists because of low farm incomes in western Canada. I am afraid that there will be insufficient participation by producers and more decisions in the pattern of those which made up the Lift program. After the event we see the mistakes and try to correct them. There will be a real distortion in price patterns.

Mr. Pepin: You change your philosophy every day.

Mr. Gleave: I am sorry; I did not hear the minister. We could have done just as much by getting a decent price for the product the farmer is selling. We shall move away from the position we occupied previously of looking at initial prices from two points of view—first, what the market will return and, second, the need of the farmer for income. This is one of the most serious aspects of the government's approach. I do not think it is realistic or practical to expect the Canadian grain farmer to compete in world markets against subsidized grain exports of other countries without aid in meeting his cost of production, without the benefit of subsidies.

I have serious doubt that we can maintain a viable working and capital structure within the grain economy no matter how much adjustment the government is able to force on the farmer or persuade him to accept. I do not think there will be sufficient total income forthcoming to enable us to maintain a viable farming structure unless marketing conditions improve drastically within the next two or three years.

I should like to move an amendment seconded by my hon. friend from Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis):

That Bill C-244 be not now read the second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the said bill should be withdrawn and that the government should consider introducing in its place two separate bills, the first of which would deal exclusively with the proposed special transitional payments, and the other with the principle of prairie grain stabilization payments.

I move this amendment because I believe the House should have an opportunity to consider objectively the full implications of the stabilization legislation the minister has brought before us. I do not think the opposition should be placed in such a position that if and when it debates the bill it is accused of preventing the measure from passing the House and, by implication, depriving farmers of the amount the government proposes to distribute.

If the minister believes the measures he proposes are sound and in the interest of prairie farmers, I challenge him to separate the \$100 million payment, which is merely the recognition of the desperate situation of prairie farmers, from the rest of the bill. Then let him bring in the measure he proposes and let it be debated on its merits in this House and in the Standing Committee on Agriculture. If he follows this course, hopefully it will be possible to make some amendments, certain revisions, so that the bill may serve the purpose which it should serve.

● (3:10 p.m.)

The concern should be not only to stabilize the prairie grain industry but also to ensure that farmers in western