

son), in respect of improving farm income. If we did these things we might find that farm communities would be more viable and much better places in which to live. This would improve the quality of life as well. Farming would then be something young people might become involved in, since they are not becoming involved in it today. The young people cannot afford to get involved in agriculture. This would be a positive result, and might be accomplished by a strong agricultural policy here in Ottawa. If we had a strong agricultural industry, all people in Canada would enjoy a higher level of income. Agriculture is still one of the primary industries in Canada. It is still the backbone of our economy. When the agricultural industry is adversely affected, other industries are negatively affected as well.

The only people who would really suffer as a result of implementing the suggestions I have made would be the huge corporations. These are the people who are really benefiting from the efforts of farmers. They are raping the farmers of western Canada. These are the people who are calling the tune. I refer to the farm machine companies and their friends, the minister in charge of the Wheat Board and his friends. It is about time we turned the tables and allowed the potential wealth of this industry to be reaped by the farmers. Decision-making should be left to the farmers. Neither of these two things is being done today, and that is precisely why we are running into so much difficulty in respect of western agriculture.

• (4:10 p.m.)

So, to summarize, I should like once again to suggest that we break this bill into two parts, and that we increase the amount of the transitional payment from what it is now, probably \$45 million, to something like \$250 million, as has been recommended by farm organizations. We can see this amount is needed when we look at the DBS figures which show that farm net income in Saskatchewan has dropped 56 per cent in two years. I do not know how the minister in charge of the Wheat Board can sit in this House with a smile on his face when he knows that people in his own riding, which is near mine, have had a drop in income during the past few years since he assumed responsibility for them. It must take smug arrogance to sit here and defend those policies when we have all the wealth, resources, as well as the technology, in Canada to do something about the situation.

Now, I notice we are getting comments from the puppets in the Liberal backbenches. This is the only time they speak out. I should like to see them do or say something constructive for a change. They should come to my constituency or the constituencies of Regina Lake Centre and Saskatoon-Biggar and make some of these remarks to the people there who are facing the brunt of the agricultural policies. It is all right to jostle back and forth in the House of Commons, but we are pretty secure here. It is the people in the country today who are taking the brunt of the stupid, inhuman and immoral policies. This is what we must fight and change. Let us stop

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

talking about the small, irrelevant points and get down to the real business of giving the farmers a better living and allowing them to participate in making decisions instead of having them made by the bureaucrats or corporations. These are the issues and this is the time for action.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill C-244, I should like to pay strict attention to the minister's remarks as recorded at page 5603 of *Hansard* when he attempted to urge the members of the House of Commons to pass the legislation as quickly as possible and not project the belief that the government is trying to do away with small farms. A complete paragraph of his remarks on that particular page, in the right hand column, dealt with that subject. He said that members in the opposition are doing a disservice to the agricultural industry by attempting to project what is actually in the mind of the government. However, it would seem to be the intention of the government to remove the operator of the small farm from the land. The minister states that this is the furthest thing from his mind. Actually, this piece of legislation, along with other pieces of legislation, was spelled out very clearly by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on June 2, 1968.

While I do not have a copy of the Prime Minister's remarks at that time, I do have a copy of an editorial in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of June 4, 1968 commenting on the Liberal farm policies. This article, in essence, paraphrases what the Prime Minister said on June 2 in outlining the farm policy. The article reads:

One of the most pressing long range problems for western farmers is the need for an adequate yearly income to get away from the boom-and-bust cycle that has become part of prairie farm life. To this end, the Liberals are proposing a plan which, in effect, sounds like the equivalent of unemployment insurance for farmers. In good years they would pay into a fund; in bad years they would draw money from the fund, thereby, to a degree, stabilizing their income.

I read this merely for the purpose of pointing out that this plan was already on the books before the present minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board was appointed to that office. When we analyse this plan carefully, we might ask where it came from. Well, we can see it must have come from former Liberal party conventions and former meetings of the Liberal greats. I suggest it came from top bureaucrats, some of whom are in the Prime Minister's office today. These are people who know nothing about agriculture and whose main theme is to get the small scale farmer off the farm in the hope that the remaining farmers, will be able to sustain themselves in an economy which is inflating so much each year. One might say I am being overly critical of the Prime Minister and his concept of agriculture, but I do not believe one would think so after reading the speech in which he dealt with the program for small farms, and also the Liberal convention policy statement.

I have correspondence here in respect of a Liberal executive meeting of April 3 and 4 which deals with the redrafting of their policy document. It contains this reference to the Canadian Wheat Board:

Protein grading for wheat is a must.