

This is a protectionist piece of legislation. It may well be passed at the expense of those regions of Canada which produce raw materials. This minister purports to be a minister of trade and commerce. I say he is a minister of protectionism. If I were to use an old western expression, I would say he is a minister of protectionism of the first water. We in western Canada ever since the turn of the century have advocated that free trade is the essence of growth. I would like to quote a former Prime Minister's verbiage in this House when he said that the Liberal Party stands for free trade. That Prime Minister's parliamentary secretary, the former member for Leeds who was later appointed a judge, stated in this House that protectionism would lead us to stagnation.

Where does the Liberal party lead us with this bill? They lead us to an undemocratic situation, because under clause 8 the accused is not given the right to be heard. I know the minister points to clause 12, but clause 12 says that the board "may receive evidence." I am not a lawyer, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes I have wished that I had become a lawyer and sometimes I am thankful that I did not. But I do know the meaning of the words "shall" and "may". "May" means that discretion lies with the board; it "may" decide to hear evidence from a person accused of importing textiles or other goods that are injurious to a Canadian manufacturing company.

If this board were set up as the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) suggested, with every region represented, I would put some faith in it. I think there would always be one or two of its members who would advocate that the accused be heard, that he be given his day in court. My amendment clearly provides:

The board, on receiving notice of a complaint, shall—

I emphasize the word "shall".

—immediately notify the person or persons involved in the importation of the alleged textile and clothing goods—

I emphasize again that I should have included the words "and other goods." All members of this House must believe in democracy. They must believe that an accused is entitled to his day in court. But the word used in clause 12 is "may." I say that if we truly believe in democracy we should stipulate that the accused shall have his day in court. On that point I rest my argument.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

GRAIN—TIME OF PAYMENTS TO FARMERS UNDER STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I asked permission to discuss this matter tonight in order to find out from the responsible minister when it is proposed to make payment of the funds which the government has decided to make available to western grain growers, and to stress the urgency of the matter. I point out to the minister that in his statement on "Proposals

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

for a production and grain receipts policy for the western grains industry" he said that Prairie farm cash receipts from the six major grains, wheat, oats, barley, rapeseed, flaxseed and rye were \$878 million in the 1969-70 crop year, down \$270 million from the figure of \$1,148 million for the preceding five years.

I think the minister himself established beyond question the urgency of the income situation in western Canada. It was this that led me to ask, on February 22, when the payments would be made. Answering my question, the minister said—and he was referring to whether payments would be made before seeding time, or June 1:

● (10:00 p.m.)

I would envisage that it would depend on the specific provisions of the legislation, which of course is not yet before the House. Therefore I doubt that there would be any possibility of this happening before seeding.

Earlier, on February 10, 1971, I had again asked the minister how soon that legislation would be brought forward. In part he replied:

We are conscious, of course, of the desirability of having this money in the hands of the grain producers as soon as possible, and I hope that as the legislation comes forward it may secure speedy passage so that this can be accomplished.

I emphasize the minister's saying that it is desirable that this be done as soon as possible. The point I wish to make tonight is this. Following certain decisions the minister has made, it is no longer necessary for him to wait until the legislation is brought down to take action on the distribution of these moneys. He has decided on the method. He has said that it is to be an acreage payment. He has stated the amounts, approximately, that will be paid on each acre and the total acreage upon which the payments will be made.

The method is not in any way tied to the details of the plan he has set out, because under the stabilization plan the idea was that the payments would be made out of funds to be raised under the plan and they were tied to payments that would be made on the grains as they were marketed in current crop years. I would point out to the minister that the legislation which he proposes to introduce will probably be discussed in committee and in the House. In that connection I wish to read a paragraph from the March 16, 1971, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool News:

The pool's board of directors also contended that two per cent of gross receipts producers are being asked to contribute is too high in relation to the plan's benefits. Also it said the plan should include features to take care of steadily rising costs of operation.

I urge the minister, since the plan has been made and since this matter is not tied in specifically any more to deductions under the plan, in the interests of the farmers to take action, to release this money and to put the machinery in motion for paying it out. I urge him to proceed as soon as possible, bearing in mind the short fall in income which I have described and the need of the farmers in the area. I am sure he has received letters similar to those I have received, setting out the extreme hardships which many farmers are facing at this time of