

Prairie Farm Assistance Act

apply as all the other farmers had sown barley, and because the rains came at a different time they lost their crops. Now where less than 10 per cent of a seeded area is sown to wheat that has broadened the act so that it can cover flax and barley and rye.

The seventh change that was made was with regard to flax and rapeseed which have now been made subject to the 1 per cent levy. They were exempt from the levy although the growers of such were eligible for award, and now they are contributing the one per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I see that the hon. member for Assiniboia has left his seat in the house. I guess he could not stand to listen to the list of improvements made by this government.

Mr. Argue: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I was in the chamber.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, Mr. Speaker, he must have left it because I did not see him.

Mr. Argue: I was in the chamber all the time.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows what is a question of privilege. One cannot get on the floor just by rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Argue: The hon. member should tell the facts.

Mr. Woolliams: I know the hon. member is in the house now because I hear the sound of his voice, but with some difficulty.

The eighth change that was made in the act was that the payment of the award will be paid in future in one lump sum in December, or as soon as possible thereafter, and so payments come to the farmer at a time when they can do him some good. These are some of the changes which were made in the act by the Conservative government, and I say we have to move a little cautiously when we are thinking of amending it. At the time those changes were made they were endorsed by the hon. member for Assiniboia, but if we were to go so far as to change the act in the way he suggests it might interfere with another branch of agriculture in reference to rehabilitation. There are lands in Alberta and Saskatchewan where, if we enlarged this act in the way the hon. member suggests, they would remain in the production of grain when they should get out of it if at all possible. It would interfere with the program presented in the last parliament by the Minister of Agriculture, and more assistance might be harmful to the whole economy of the farmers wherever they may be situated.

There is one other thing I would like to mention in reference to my hon. friend when he attacks us on agricultural matters, and

especially when he talks about acreage payments. When they were first introduced in the house he was the man who called them "peanuts". But now three successive payments have been made, and when he was campaigning in 1962, on behalf of the new party he now represents, he did not call the payments peanuts because he knew the farmers appreciated them.

The acreage payments were made by this government and they were based on a two-price system. We consume approximately 45 million bushels of grain per year, and \$1 a bushel was the basis for the two-price system, yet the spokesman for agriculture in the Liberal party stood in his place today and said there was no scientific or economic basis for the acreage payments. That was the basis and that was the foot in the door of the two-price system.

All these proposals must be studied very carefully before they are implemented. As I said before, when the hon. member attacks us he uses the same words as he used to use when he was sitting with the C.C.F. party. I have said this before but it is time it was repeated, that we cannot forget, when dealing with the hon. member for Assiniboia, that he said the farmers—

—will never forget that it was the Liberal party, by the removal of price control and by its tragic loss of overseas markets that placed agriculture in its present position.

"I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to defend on the public platform, if he can, the dismal failure of 22 years of Liberal administration to meet agricultural problems..."

Yet he patted his chest today and said this was one good act brought in by the Liberals. Let hon. members read *Hansard* and they will find this in it. He said:

I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to defend on the public platform, if he can, the dismal failure of 22 years of Liberal administration to meet agricultural problems as well as his own record in this regard both as a member of the former Liberal government and as leader of the Liberal party.

He also said:

The Liberal party is not going anywhere because its leader, Pearson, does not know where he is going.

If the leader of the Liberal party does not know where he is going, all I can say is that he will not know where he is going if he listens to the hon. member for Assiniboia who changes his tune every time he speaks.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I should like to say a few words on this motion which suggests some amendments to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. As I understand it, it is asking for a 100 per cent increase in the maximum payment, from \$4 per acre to \$8 per acre. It is asking for a 100 per cent