

to make more money available to farmers, then the government should think in terms of at least increasing the amount paid on the unit quota delivered.

I know that any suggestion we on this side of the house put forward is unlikely to be met with acceptance by the government. I was just a young fellow then, but I clearly recall ten or 11 years ago when the farmers union, the C.C.F. and the Progressive Conservatives were advocating cash advance legislation. The government said this was impossible, but the Conservative administration took over and did it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Schreyer: That legislation was practical to implement; yet many people in high places prior to 1957 said it was not feasible or practical. With respect to the problem now looming, I suggest that unless the movement of wheat from terminal positions can be increased and this may require special sales efforts—the government should think in terms of amending the cash advance legislation, or else think in terms of increasing the amount paid on the unit quota delivered. The government should do something, and not leave the problem to be borne solely by the wheat producers.

To give hon. members an indication of how drastic the problem is becoming I may say I happen to know that certain farm organizations are in process of sending trade possibility investigating teams to different parts of the world. One such team was dispatched by a prairie farm union to Japan at its own expense, in order to see whether some stimulus could be injected into Japan's imports of wheat from Canada. This indicates that many people do not have much confidence in the government's efforts, because they are sending these teams at their own expense.

● (9:40 p.m.)

If this should continue for another few weeks or months, then surely it would be legitimate to ask whether this government is carrying out the services for which its departments are being allocated public funds. Very unfortunately, in the months of August, September, and October to date it would seem that our record in export sales of wheat is not an improving but rather a deteriorating one.

Mr. Reg Cantelon (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, in talking about this problem, which in the future I feel will be a great deal more

Loss to Canada of World Wheat Market

serious than it is today, I think it is wise that we should take a look at some of the statements which have appeared in the press. I am sure some hon. members will have read an editorial which appeared in the *Western Producer* of September 28, 1967, under the heading "Wheat Prices a Major Crisis". It begins by telling how Mr. Charles Gibbings has been very much disturbed by this crisis and quotes him as saying:

Canadian wheat producers are facing the most critical marketing situation that has existed for more than twenty years.

The United States is now pursuing a policy of selling wheat at whatever price is necessary to make sales. Through the government's failure to assess properly the world wheat situation, by being painfully slow in seeing what the Americans were doing, and by our brinkmanship at the negotiations table when the new wheat agreement was being concluded, we now find ourselves in the painful price position in which we are today.

The *Globe and Mail* of September 26, 1967, had this to say:

Canadian wheat exports in August showed a sharp decrease from August, 1966 and a substantial decrease from the ten year average for the month.

I could put these figures on the record, but I think everyone who is interested knows what the figures are. I think the most significant thing in the whole business is what happened to our Japanese market. Our sales to Japan this year were 1.8 million bushels and last year they were 6.9 million bushels. It is pretty obvious that our marketings have suffered very seriously. In fact we would not be talking about this if it were not true. Mr. Roy Atkinson, president of the National Farmers Union, charged on September 12 that the United States was slashing prices in a calculated attempt to scuttle prospects for a new international wheat agreement. I have been paraphrasing his words, but the idea was just as strongly expressed. Mr. Gibbings believes that all nations participating in the Geneva agreement have a moral obligation to observe the floor price to which they agree. You will notice, however, that he says, "moral obligation" and sometimes, unfortunately, in international business moral obligations are not held to very well.

As Mr. Gibbings put it, "Technical difficulties in completing the final document should not serve as an excuse to break the floor." Mr. Gibbings also said that he had sent a telegram to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) on Sept. 12, urging