

payment for his herd. The remainder could follow after the premises have been cleaned up and inspected.

Fifth, another question plaguing farmers with regard to brucellosis is the whole matter of income tax. The income tax status of a farmer who loses an entire herd because of brucellosis could be based on a five-year average. However, this is not very satisfactory and I believe consideration should be given to farmers whose herds are sold because of a government law or edict.

Now I should like to speak on another topic, namely, the rapeseed vote about which we heard a few days ago. I believe it is a phony vote, a masterpiece of Liberal trickery with which the members of the Tory party agree completely, it seems to me. I say this because the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta), who is the Conservative Party's spokesman and replied to the minister's statement last week regarding the rapeseed vote, stated that perhaps the vote should not be taken after all. He seemed to be very pleased that the cards were stacked against the proponents of orderly marketing.

There are three things about the vote that are phony and dishonest, and I certainly cannot see how it can be compatible with the so-called Liberal philosophy, if they have any philosophy. First of all, there is the matter of the 60 per cent majority required. Would it not be something if our whole democratic system were based on a 60 per cent majority and we could not win a seat in the House unless we had 60 per cent of the vote? I feel that these guidelines should be revised and all that should be required in this case would be a simple majority. If slightly over half the farmers say they want rapeseed under the administration and jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, that is the way it should be.

Second, only those rapeseed producers can vote who have produced rapeseed two years out of the last three years. This is ridiculous also, and certainly mitigates against the farmer in the northern prairies. I say this because the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), or the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, may not be aware of this but three years ago we had a severe outbreak of the Bertha army worm in the northern prairies, right across the north. Many farmers lost their crops or spent a great deal of money spraying them from aeroplanes. The crops were severely damaged.

● (2130)

Following this experience, and on the advice of many farm experts, farmers were told that it would be to their benefit if they did not grow rapeseed on those fields for several years. Consequently, many rapeseed producers went out of production during the last two years. Therefore, in many cases the traditional rapeseed producer has grown only one crop in the last three years, and now he is not allowed to vote. I think the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board is aware of this and did it deliberately in collusion with his Tory colleagues. I think that all Wheat Board permit holders should have the right to vote, or failing this, anyone who produced at least one crop of rapeseed within the last five years. This would certainly be more just so far as the rapeseed producers of western Canada are concerned.

### *Agriculture*

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the ballot paper is to have "yes" and "no" categories and also an "undecided" category. This is totally unfair because apparently the undecided category is to count as a "no" vote. This further stacks the cards against the farmers who are interested in an orderly system of marketing in this country. Apparently there are powerful forces at work to destroy the concept of orderly marketing in Canada, into which years of labour and toil have been put by farm organizations, wheat pools and farmers' groups on the prairie provinces, at least ever since the 1920's, the beginning of the progressive movement, the labour movement, the co-ops and what-have-you.

Every farmer who supports the principle of orderly marketing through the Canadian Wheat Board should be extremely uneasy and concerned at the announcement by the minister responsible for the Wheat Board on the new feed grains policy and the apparent support he is getting from the Conservative Party. They are being awfully quiet about that policy. All they talk about is supply and demand, as though supply and demand existed in this country today. The minister has spoken of the "equity" he is trying to create for livestock producers in British Columbia and eastern Canada in order that they need not pay more for feed grains than livestock producers in the prairie region, except for the costs of transportation and handling. Unfortunately the model of equity he intends to use is the notoriously inequitable and unjust open market feed mill and feed lot prices for feed grains paid to farmers for years in the prairie region. In order to extend this kind of equity, at the grain producers' expense, to other parts of Canada the function of the Canadian Wheat Board in setting prices on all domestic sales is done away with.

What has been the Wheat Board's crime? Apparently it had come to the attention of feed grain purchasers in eastern Canada that the Wheat Board was doing a much better job of getting a good return for grain producers on the Prairies than were the prairie feed mills and feed lots. It was doing so much better, in fact, that eastern livestock feeders felt they were at a competitive disadvantage with prairie livestock feeders, in spite of the fact that they get \$5 per hundredweight more for their cattle here than they do in the west.

How, then, to create equity? "At the expense of prairie grain producers," says the minister. The Wheat Board will no longer set prices for any feed grains sold in Canada. Feed mills and feed lots, which for years have paid grain producers the lowest possible price, often below production costs, now dictate the price at which feed grains will be sold in the rest of Canada as well. In this way the minister claims he is creating equity. For whom? He is supposed to be responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, an organization which serves the interests of grain producers. But obviously he is catering to agribusiness interests. The policy is designed to put a potential candidate for leadership of the Liberal Party—I am referring to the Minister of Justice—on the right side of the Quebec farmer and of the politicians who speak for the Quebec farmer. The minister attacked my colleague, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave). My colleague stated facts and figures, and the minister did not like those facts and figures.