

There is too much governmental control and interference except in the case of the most successful crop, rapeseed. Now Ottawa is jumping on the bandwagon "to become associated with the rapeseed success story of western Canada."

These statements were made by one of the most respected and knowledgeable men in the grain trade. He has since been replaced as head of the Board of Grain Commissioners, and this concerns all of us interested in the trade. The man who has taken his place, Mr. Delmar Pound, is probably a capable man but I am sure no more so than the former commissioner, since some of Mr. Pound's experience was gained as campaign manager to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson).

The bill before us will undoubtedly be of help to the farmer. It is interesting to note that an amendment was moved in the Agricultural Committee not too long ago that would guarantee the farmers yearly income boosts comparable to those received by other organized sectors of the economy. I believe a 5 per cent or 6 per cent income boost was proposed. Why does this government not consider a built-in price increase on agricultural commodities? They grant wage boosts to industry and even to members right here in this House, so why are farmers left out? The government is supposedly trying to improve the situation and would like the farmers out west to think so, but they turned down this proposal.

These things are a mystery to me, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the ministers responsible will explain why they continue with stop-gap measures instead of getting to the root of the problem. I know that the minister in charge of the Wheat Board realizes the importance of doing something in the farming belt if the agricultural sector is to continue at all. As a representative of the farmers in this House I feel that the minister must make his position or his thoughts known to the cabinet, or do as any man of intestinal fortitude would do—get with it or get out.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I have sat through much of this quite lengthy debate. It may give some hon. members comfort to know that this particular phase of the farming debate is coming to an end.

With regard to cash advances I want to say briefly that in 1957, when the Conservative party took office, the situation on the farms of western Canada was almost identical to the situation today. Grain had been piled up on the farms. There was a surplus of about 700 million bushels of grain and a shortage of cash flow and cash return for farm produce. Today we find ourselves in similar circumstances.

There has been a myth spread over the land these last two years regarding the surplus of grain. I want to talk about world surplus. I would be the last to say that there was not a surplus in various exporting countries, but the fact is that Canada has moved from being first among the wheat exporting country of the world to fifth or sixth. If we had retained our export position, this cash advance bill would not have been so important. Shortly after we implemented legislation in this regard, the Diefenbaker government managed to sell and export grain and got it off the farm.

Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act

In 1957, 1958 and 1959 very few cash advances were taken up by the farmers because grain was moving. When produce is moving to market, cash advances are not necessary. A similar situation exists in the corn belt of the United States, where the government goes in, buys the product outright and puts a seal on the bin. The commodity then belongs to the government and not the farmer, although it is stored on his farm. Under the Canadian system the farmer got only approximately half the value of the commodity, and when it is delivered to the country elevator the department takes its share on the cash advance and that money is returned, so really it is a part payment for grain.

As every speaker has said—and this matter affects the whole western economy—there is a shortage of cash in agriculture and a depression today in western Canada. There are three or four bills on farming matters now before the House. If the government had come clean with Parliament and with the country regarding the constitutional matter which is before the Canadian people and the Supreme Court of Canada, this debate would have been shorter and the problems on the farm would have quickly disappeared.

One of the problems of marketing is that some of the ten provinces are now setting stringent regulations at provincial borders, preventing the free flow of produce from one province to another. That is what I meant today in the question period when I said that we were moving toward the balkanization of Canada.

I want to deal briefly with the questions that were raised yesterday. Surely this government, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) or the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) could say, "We are going to test the Manitoba case in the Supreme Court of Canada. The Manitoba Court of Appeal has declared it ultra vires. We will brief the top counsel of Canada and adopt a national approach to marketing, not the narrow, parochial approach that might affect only the Maritimes or the west."

I now understand the Liberal party for the first time. They believe in a ten-nation program.

● (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Gibson: Where did the hon. member read that?

Mr. Woolliams: I want the hon. member to read this speech and think about it. If he would listen more and be as polite to me as I am to him, and keep his mind as open as his mouth, he would make a great contribution to Parliament.

Mr. Gibson: My mind is open.

Mr. Woolliams: Section 121 of the British North America Act provides:

All articles of the growth, produce, or manufacture of any one of the provinces shall, from and after the union, be admitted free into each of the other provinces.

I maintain that regulations enacted by various provincial governments seek to prevent the free flow of farm products among provinces. Any such legislation—I am