

it, and sell the stuff. If that does not keep the farms viable, it becomes necessary for agricultural policy to do so.

There is a lot of talk about increased income in the calendar year 1972. In western Canada this increase in income was due solely to a reduction in inventories. I think that if the true picture were laid out one would see that the situation is still very serious there.

The provinces in western Canada certainly should have more input to the Canadian Wheat Board. The Canadian Wheat Board is so important to the well being of Saskatchewan that the provincial government certainly should name someone to the commission or to the advisory board.

On Saturday, along with my colleague to my left, I attended the National Farmers Union meeting in Regina and listened to the minister of agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan say he found it impossible to deal with the federal government on agricultural matters. I think this is tragic for the farmers of western Canada. What we need is a guaranteed purchase program. We need an international grains agreement. We need an income stabilization plan, and we need a national grain bank.

Mr. Bill Knight (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to a conclusion this debate on one of the most fundamental questions facing western Canada today in terms of agricultural policy. This debate was initiated by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) in order to bring about a clear statement of where the Conservative and Liberal parties stand on the question of the orderly marketing of western feed grains under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. I am afraid that the farmers in no way, in no shape or form, have been satisfied, or assured, or given the confidence of either major party in this House.

Where does all this problem begin? It begins with the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board making a statement, in a telegram to the western premiers, with respect to a feed grains policy and saying he will not announce the new policy until the western economic opportunities conference is held.

In this telegram does he give any real assurance about the role of the Canadian Wheat Board in this whole operation? No, Mr. Speaker. Does the agricultural critic for the Conservative party reassure the western farmers that the marketing of feed grains will stay under the Canadian Wheat Board? In no way, Mr. Speaker. In no way in this debate have we once had a guarantee from the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. Hamilton), from the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave), or from the minister in charge of the Wheat Board that the marketing of western feed grains will remain under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board.

This so-called Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board has been flying balloons on this issue, or blimps as my colleague from Fraser Valley wants to call them. But he has been telling the people of western Canada what is the government's policy on feed grains.

This is summed up in his telegram to the western premiers, and it has upset every person who sits on a wheat pool committee in this country, every person who is a

Feed Grains

member of the National Farmers Union, every person who is interested in the national orderly marketing of grains under the Wheat Board. In his telegram he stated:

Any national policy on feed grains must preserve effective authority and control by the Canadian Wheat Board over exports of feed grains and the over-all supervision by it of the interprovincial movement of feed grains.

This is something which the Tory party agrees with, which we agree with, and I think Social Credit too. That's export marketing. He talks about "over-all supervision by it of the interprovincial movement of feed grains." I say balderdash, Mr. Speaker. All that means is that there is to be the removal of the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board over the movement of feed grains in Canada, and neither the Liberal party nor the Conservative party have told us anything different.

Where does this kind of stuff come from? Does it come from the western premiers? Does it come from the Minister of Justice himself? No, it comes from that grand economist who never saw a farm until they drew up their task force report on agriculture, where at page 131 the following appeared:

New Marketing Guidelines for Coarse Grains—That the Canadian Wheat Board continue to be responsible for all commercial purchases of barley and oats from the primary producer but that:

- (a) each purchase by the Wheat Board should be hedged in futures market at the time of the purchase or as an alternative, provision should be made by the Board to hedge daily a certain quantity of coarse grains in the futures market.

● (0100)

And furthermore, it carried on to the point that all the Canadian Wheat Board is set up for in terms of marketing of feed grains is what we hear from the minister—not in the balloon statement reported by the *Globe and Mail* but in the telegram sent by this minister to western premiers on this issue respecting the question of supervision. The fact of the matter is that in this whole matter the control, power and jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board is being lessened and taken away. That is the policy, not a balloon as some people have said.

May I take the opportunity of referring to somebody who has been ignored in this debate—the Chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board. I want to point out to the minister and to the loyal opposition—who are being so loyal to the government today—that the Chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board made the following remarks, remarks that no westerner should ever forget:

Appearing before the Standing Committee on Agriculture on May 8, 1973, he said at page 5:17:

Remember our job as the Canadian Wheat Board—and I make no apologies for it because you understand it fully—is to do the best job possible for the western Canadian farmer. Under that premise, we feel justified that it was fair to do what we did this crop year. I may also point out that it was only because there was a Wheat Board customer marketing that it was possible to protect supplies quantitatively for the domestic market.

He then went on to say—and maybe once in a while the man who is handling the Wheat Board ought to be listened to by the minister:

Under a free market system you easily could have found the Canadian feeder in eastern Canada in a position where Canada had been denuded of supplies. The United States came very close