

this bill passed, I am sure it would receive the support of this side of the House. Unfortunately, however, it has been dealt with as "filler" legislation brought in on three or four successive Friday afternoons in order to round out a week's activity. It deserves better, Mr. Speaker.

I have one more comment to make before I close, Mr. Speaker. It is unfortunate that the government has not set the initial price of wheat higher than the present level. The initial price for the next crop year is 25 cents per bushel less than the initial price producers are presently receiving. I find this rather shocking in view of the fact that grain prices have increased. There is really no reason why initial grain prices could not be increased substantially.

I should now like to refer to some comments made to me in the House on May 16 by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), as reported at page 1176 of *Hansard*. At that time the Farm Improvement Loans Act was under debate. I was making the point that producers would be interested in receiving more for their products so that they would not have to borrow money. When you borrow money you have to pay it back. I urged the minister seriously to consider increasing the initial price of grain. I had been referring to the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board who sits in the other place when the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:

He is, and he is very much aware of it.

I replied that I heard the Minister of Agriculture talking about increasing the initial price and he replied, "It will be done."

That was May 16, Mr. Speaker, but so far we have not seen any action. I would encourage both the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of State responsible for the Wheat Board to increase the initial price of wheat. This is something that could be done very easily, would be well received and is long overdue for western grain producers.

● (1530)

In closing, in the three months since the throne speech was delivered on April 14, we have seen some great inconsistencies in what is contained in the throne speech with regard to agriculture. If the government is serious about keeping some of the commitments it made in the throne speech, I urge that it look very seriously at addressing some of the problems I have tried to point out here this afternoon.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, it is really encouraging to see a western member occupying the Speaker's chair in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Waddell: At the conclusion of his remarkable speech when he was urging the building of a Canadian transcontinental railway, Sir John A. Macdonald, then prime minister of Canada, had this to say as reported at page 494 of volume one of the *Hansard* debates of 1880-81:

The Address—Mr. Waddell

I can trust to the intelligence of this House, and the patriotism of this country, I can trust not only to the patriotism but to the common sense of this country to carry out an arrangement which will give us all we want, which will satisfy all the loyal legitimate aspirations which will give us a great, an united, a rich, an improving, a developing Canada, instead of making us tributary to American laws, to American—

—gas companies—

—to American bondage, to American tolls, to American freights, to all the little tricks and big tricks that American—

—gas companies—

—are addicted to—

I have made a change in two places in that speech by Sir John. In two places I changed the word "railways" to "gas companies". Otherwise that is the verbatim statement of Sir John A. Macdonald in this very House in discussing the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. Kempling: How can you change words and say it is a verbatim statement?

Mr. Waddell: I want to use those remarks and refer to a decision that is being made this very afternoon by cabinet somewhere in this building, or on the Hill, probably one of the most important decisions for Canada. In the Speech from the Throne, the government in its own words says that pipelines are really like railways; that what railways were in the nineteenth century, pipelines are in the twentieth century. Today the cabinet of Canada must decide what they are going to do about authorizing the pre-build of the Alaska highway natural gas pipeline.

The minister of trade was here a minute ago. I thought he might be interested in this. The economic development agency in the United States, in a pre-hearing procedure this week, suggested that it might have the United States back out of Canadian gas imports, back out of the sales. I suspect that cabinet this afternoon must be asking itself why we are sticking our neck out in approving this pre-build if the Americans are going to act that way. I suspect that is one of the elements in the delay today, yesterday and before that.

I like to think that myself and my party had something to do with the delay in pressing for rejection of this crazy scheme, but I think I am honest and probably realistic enough to know that the delay was probably a deliberate action by cabinet, that they were about to make a very big mistake and the Americans do not deserve to get this handed to them on a platter.

I equated pipelines with railways and I quoted Sir John because the pipeline issue today involves some of the issues that involved railways in the past, including the whole issue of Canadian independence. The whole issue of Canadian energy security is the reason for some of the questions I put in the past week and a half to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde). It also raises the whole issue of the role of Parliament.

In addition to the members and the press, I notice there are full galleries in the House today with many Canadians visiting here. I would like to try and simplify what is involved in this