

*Adjournment Debate*

In spite of all the rhetoric I heard this afternoon from some of the Conservatives who spoke on this motion, this country is doing some of that right now. We have a two-price system for wheat at the moment, based at \$7 a bushel for wheat consumed in this country, which comes close to the cost of production. We are doing that, and it is not wrecking the economy particularly, neither is it doing a whole lot of good. However, it applies only to domestically consumed wheat used for human consumption and does not go quite as far as the Bill which was presented by my friend, the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville, which would include wheat, oats and barley consumed by livestock and used for other purposes of animal and poultry production.

As anyone who understands agriculture will know, with those products already being produced under supply-management systems, namely, broiler chickens, turkeys, eggs and dairy products, there is no problem coping with this increased feed cost. It simply goes into the price of the product, which would be reflected, granted, in higher prices to consumers. However, it would also mean a much stronger rural community and agricultural base.

I think what makes farmers upset is when they hear speeches such as we heard from some Hon. Members today, who delivered all the old shibboleths about how impossible it is to control surpluses and how one must have a market system which reflects the true market rather than the cost of production. Most farmers begin to ask themselves, why it is that only I have to contend with this kind of market? They remark how few other producers contend with that type of market system. They look around at the things they buy and compare costs in terms of direct trades. I hear my friends and neighbours saying that the last time they bought a new car in 1977, they spent 2,000 bushels of No. 1 wheat to buy that car, which cost about \$6,000. It was a full-size Chevrolet with everything on it. Now when they go to price a full-size Chevrolet with everything on it, they find it will cost at least \$18,000, and it will take about 8,000 bushels of No. 1 wheat to buy that car.

Some of my friends opposite talked about technological change and how new technology would bring new advantages and permit the lowering of costs. From my simple vantage point of sitting on the farm and in this House, I know that a great deal of technological change has occurred in the automobile industry since 1977 when a new Chevrolet cost about 2,000 bushels of wheat. I know that has not resulted in a lower-priced car. It is now going to cost 8,000 bushels of wheat to buy the same thing, and they have not even changed the models very much. As you know, Mr. Speaker, they almost look the same. Yet the price is more than four times as high in terms of producing a bushel of wheat.

I know we on the farm are a very efficient lot. However, our production techniques have not changed greatly since 1977, either. We have perhaps tooled up to a little larger equipment than was generally in use in 1977, but for most farms in my area, the equipment has not gone through any great technological changes. We were using four-wheel drive tractors and 30

to 50 foot cultivating and seeding machinery then, and we are doing so now. The cost of a number of things we are using in the new technology of grain production have increased quite markedly in that time. Fertilizer prices are more than double since that period of time. In fact, going back to 1977, I would warrant they have almost tripled. Chemicals have increased two, three and four times, depending on the kind of chemical. Fuel costs have doubled and tripled in that period of time as well. Yet farmers are being asked to take relatively shrinking prices for their production while looking around and seeing that everything they buy on the market, which is supposed to reflect all of the technological advantages of industry in North America, costs in our terms four and five times as much as they receive for our product. We realize that those manufacturers are working in a market-place which reflects their cost of production and that is why they have put the price up four and five times what it was back in 1977. They are recovering their full costs of production, plus a profit, and the intention of my Hon. friend the, Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville, is to set in place a few market mechanisms so that farmers will have the same opportunity for their products.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 36(2), the order shall be dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

• (1800)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—CONFIDENCE IN SYSTEM—  
MINISTER'S POSITION

**Mr. Alan Redway (York East):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have ever asked you what it is that makes you wake up in the morning. I would like to know what it is. Perhaps it is the sunlight that streams through the window in the morning. Perhaps it is an alarm clock; or perhaps it is a clock-radio.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I am awakened by a clock-radio, and more often than not, it is not soft music that I awaken to but a loud authoritative news voice giving me some news and some comment, and usually the news, or at least part of it, includes a description of some very grisly crime that has occurred, and that authoritative news voice is telling me that we should be bringing back capital punishment. It berates those who oppose capital punishment or who are wavering a little on capital punishment in any way, shape or form.