

*Withholding of Grain Payments*

They are not here because Shell, B.P. and Esso carry out their research and development in the United States, in France or in Great Britain and they develop their secondary industry in those countries.

All the jobs—and there are thousands of them—that are accruing in this industry do not benefit Canada at all but, rather, benefit other countries which have gained control of our industry. Therefore, if we began to move in a significant direction in regaining control of the petroleum industry, using public capital to get perhaps 50 per cent plus one of the shares, we could do three things simultaneously: first, we could stop the export of profits outside our country and thereby improve our balance of payments situation; second, we could put Canadian scientists to work doing research and development in Canada and, third, get the spin-off products in the petrochemical field which would lead to secondary industry being created here instead of outside the country. Thus we would improve our employment situation. Simultaneously, three worth while objectives could be achieved for Canadians.

Obviously, I do not have time to elaborate on each of these points, but I suggest that this kind of issue, this kind of general situation, should be receiving serious discussion when we have a bill of this nature before the House. May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the Chair, to resume same at eight o'clock p.m. May I remind hon. members that at that time a motion to adjourn the House will be presented, pursuant to section 9 of Standing Order 26.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26****GRAIN****WITHHOLDING BY GOVERNMENT OF PAYMENTS UNDER TEMPORARY WHEAT RESERVES ACT—FARMERS' ECONOMIC PLIGHT**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. Pursuant to Standing Order 26, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) seconded by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) moves:

That this House do now adjourn.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, as the first speaker tonight I should like to put on record the motion I moved earlier today. As you will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, this was a motion for adjournment under Standing Order 26, where the Chair has sole jurisdiction in determining the importance of the debate in question.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

The question we are now debating arises from the serious shortage of cash and income of the Canadian farmer, making it almost impossible for him, not only in western Canada but elsewhere, to continue farming operations and to make a living from farming. This situation has been aggravated by a decrease in the price per bushel of grain, caused by the failure of the Canadian Wheat Board to receive from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, which is the treasury, cash for the storage of grain for the crop year 1970-71 and that portion of the crop year 1971-72 to date.

As I have said, earlier today I moved:

That the House adjourn to discuss the serious cost squeeze and present economic plight of the farmer which has been further aggravated, and their income seriously reduced by the failure of the Canadian Wheat Board to receive moneys for storage of grain for the crop years 1970-71 and 1971-72 to date from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

At the outset I might say that is not solely a debate on the fact that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) has broken the law of Canada, that the minister in charge of the Wheat Board (Mr. Lang) has acquiesced in the breaking of the law, plus the fact that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has even failed to print in the Revised Statutes of Canada the statute which spells out the law.

This debate has even more serious ramifications. I am sure that even the farmers who are concerned about their livelihood will appreciate that the debate centres around a more serious problem than the mere materialism involved in the storage of grain. This debate poses the rhetorical question: Is this institution of Parliament, which includes the House of Commons, the Senate and all the law-making processes, to be one that will be controlled by the executive? In brief, shall there be a law that shall apply to some and shall not apply to others? Shall the laws be obeyed by some of the people some of the time, or shall there be laws that will not be obeyed by some of the people all of the time—and here I mean the executive of the country?

Coming to the meat of what we are about to discuss, I wish to refer briefly to the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, a statute of Canada passed by Parliament, the supreme law-making power in this country. It is an act which was passed in 1956 by a Liberal government. It has now been flaunted and the government of the day refuses to obey it. Here is what the act provides:

Where, after the 31st day of July, 1955, the stocks of wheat of the board exceed one hundred and seventy-eight million bushels at the commencement of a crop year, the Minister of Finance shall—

Not "may"

—out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, pay to the board for each day in that crop year an amount equal to the portion of the said stocks that exceeds one hundred and seventy-eight million bushels at the commencement of that crop year, multiplied by the carrying charge rate paid by the board at the end of the immediately preceding crop year.

What is that all about? There are two kinds of wheat storage. First there is wheat stored on the farm. In that case the storage is paid by the farmer. But when wheat is finally purchased by the Canadian Wheat Board it is stored in the country elevators which dot the landscape of western Canada, at the Great Lakes which is the shipping centre for sending wheat down the St. Lawrence waterway to Europe, at Vancouver from where it is sent to Asia,