

Withholding of Grain Payments

or at Churchill from where it is sent both to Europe and Asia. The act provides that where the quantity of wheat stored in this manner exceeds 178 million bushels, the Minister of Finance shall pay out of the treasury so much money to the Canadian Wheat Board for that storage.

That is the law of Canada, which has not been repealed. That was the law which was made by this institution, approved by the Senate and received royal assent. That law is being flaunted today by none other than the Minister of Finance, acquiesced in by the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. That is what the debate is about.

The Minister of Finance is not here. I am not making anything of that because we know he is attending an international meeting. The minister in charge of the Wheat Board was dean of the law school of the university from which I graduated in Saskatchewan. That university was founded in 1905. My father saw the brush cleared in Saskatoon and the foundations laid for that institution. This minister, a native son of western Canada, rose to his position because he is a Rhodes scholar. I have students in my own office whom he must have taught that the ethics of law is to understand and obey the law. I am astounded that the dean of that university would come into this institution, with all its traditions, and acquiesce in breaking the law of Canada in respect of the sum of \$100 million, more or less.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Woolliams: It is hard to grasp the significance of that action. If it had been the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), who is merely a water boy to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or a water boy to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, I would understand and probably put it down to ignorance of the law, although that is no defence. But when it is a schooled and trained man who does not and will not accept the seriousness of obedience to the law, how can he ask the citizens of this country to obey the law? There is one law for some who obey and one law for some who do not obey, and I am afraid I have to put the minister in charge of the Wheat Board in the latter category.

We are not only debating tonight whether western Canada has been discriminated against or whether the minister has failed to carry out the terms and conditions of the law but, what is more important, whether this place will be supreme for the people of Canada, whether this place will always be supreme for the freedom of the people of Canada, and whether this place will remain supreme as the law-making institution in Canada and, above all—particularly with this government—whether this place will remain supreme against oppression. We might also ask whether this place will be supreme against law breakers, including the minister and the executive. When I mention the Minister of Finance and the minister in charge of the Wheat Board I might include, in passing, the Minister of Justice.

Tonight I say to the news media of Canada, check the new Statutes of Canada. Go through them. The Minister of Justice has an obligation to print in the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, the statutes passed by this institution. Search as you will, you will not find an act called the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. You will have to refer to the old statutes, just as if the act had been repealed. I

must say it is as if they had *mens rea*—the feeling that they were going to break the law—in the first place, because they would not even print the law.

An hon. Member: Premeditated.

Mr. Woolliams: I would remind him, through you, Mr. Speaker, that Mackenzie King made a great speech in which he said that the law should be such in Canada that Canadians should know it. A Canadian should be able to find it as he walks, runs, lies in bed or as he reads. How are Canadians to determine the law of this nation when it is hidden, when it is not even in the new statutes? To me that is even more important than what has been done to western Canada.

It will be interesting to see how the minister, a former dean of the law school of Saskatoon, a Rhodes scholar, a man who is supposed to be steeped—I should have said “stooped”, because he stooped to break the law—in the law and jurisprudence, defends himself. There is no defence. Members from all over have stood in their place seeking answers. In particular, the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) has been most tenacious in trying to get answers. Let me put on the record the question he put to the minister after encountering some difficulty:

Mr. Speaker, will the minister advise the House why the federal government has refrained from making payments under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act which is now on the statute books as Canadian law under which the payment of \$61 million was to be made to Canadian farmers?

Here is the only answer we could get from the minister after days of probing by the hon. member for Vegreville. This member had moved motions similar to mine day after day, and finally the Speaker in his wisdom granted my motion so that we could have this debate as the people's representatives. The minister replied:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As was indicated to the House last October, it was the belief of the government it was a much better form to make payments directly to farmers of the \$100 million rather than make payments under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act—

In other words he said, “Look, I belong to the cabinet. I never sat as a backbencher. When I came here I was like the bishop, I had a laying on of hands and I became the minister. In that position I do not care about the law; I supersede the law with my own knowledge.” What the minister wants, and the new jurisprudence he has developed for Canada shows, is that Canada should be governed by the rule of people and not the rule of law. That must be the jurisprudence he wants; but if he taught it at the law school from which I graduated, it must have been after I left. I do not recall any professor teaching me that the executive rules the country. I do recall what the Nazis did in Germany. They burned down the Reichstag because they did not want a parliament.

If you are going to carry on this way you might as well lock the door, because you are treating us like children in a play-pen dancing to your tunes; you are a puppet of the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: I do not do this lightly, Mr. Speaker, but tonight I call for the resignation of the minister from