

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

• (9:00 p.m.)

I could go on and on. You will confuse the farmers with this amendment. It is not as though the opposition feel they are doing something to help the farmers. If they were to sit down with five farmers and discuss this proposal they would know that it should not be carried out. They just want to resort to red herring techniques in this House and give the impression that they are fighting for the farmers.

I see the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is leaving the chamber. In all sincerity I should like to congratulate his brother on being appointed Minister of Agriculture in the provincial government. I am sure he will be an asset to that department with his wide knowledge and experience. I have listened to him speak with his colleagues about their new prairie coalition—a kind of oddball coalition, Mr. Speaker. I was interested when he said that the government was trying to ram legislation down their throats. I have the feeling that I have heard that before. It may well be that the real Minister of Agriculture for Alberta could be sitting not too far from me in this House of Commons. I would not suggest the advice given to the brother would not be good—only time will tell.

Mr. Horner: He is the older brother.

Mr. Pringle: I have been involved in and associated with the farming industry for most of my life and I have no illusions about the financial problems which plague farmers. I have made money with them and I have lost money with them. I have worked with them and I have been in a secondary industry, which always is a preferred industry. A relative of mine taught me that it was a little better to farm the farmers than to farm. I admit I had that advantage. In their opposition to this bill some people are working for the man who farms the farmers, not the farmers. I do not blame them for getting the support; it is good support.

An hon. Member: How do you figure that out?

An hon. Member: Explain that.

Mr. Pringle: There is a worldwide concept—

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Horner: I rise on a question of privilege. While I appreciate the hon. member's remarks and his wisdom at most times, he said that hon. members who are opposed to this legislation are opposed to it for personal reasons or political reasons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: I want to point out that if this legislation passes I have already been informed that I will receive a cheque for \$928.98. If it is not passed I will receive nothing under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. I have not produced any wheat in the past two years and I will receive nothing.

An hon. Member: What is the point?

Mr. Horner: The point is that hon. members are accused of doing things for personal reasons.

Mr. Benjamin: Are your motives as pure as that, Pringle?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair is of the opinion that the point raised by the hon. member was well taken, in the sense that no hon. member should cast any reflection on the integrity or sincerity of hon. members. I am sure that it was not meant in that sense by the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle). The Chair was not following the debate attentively at that particular time, however. Perhaps the hon. member would continue his remarks.

Mr. Pringle: Mr. Speaker, I want it placed on the record right now that there is no way I would accuse an hon. member of doing anything in the House for personal gain. I was simply referring to the fact that they were being influenced by secondary industry, and I believe that is true. Maybe they are not, but the assumption occurs to me because of the advantage the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act Provides for elevator companies. Under this act the farmers would be paid directly.

There is a worldwide concept that food must be cheap, regardless of the cost of production.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Is the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Nystrom: No, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. member would answer a question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member knows that he can ask a question only if the hon. member who has the floor accepts it.

Mr. Pringle: I do not have much time left—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: If I could answer the question I would be glad to do so, but I am almost at the end of my time and I have much more to say.

Mr. Horner: Have you?

Mr. Pringle: I worked on this speech all morning.

Mr. Alexander: You wouldn't know it.

Mr. Horner: The whole thing sounds like an afterthought.

Mr. Pringle: There is a worldwide concept that food must be cheap, regardless of the cost of production. Food must be high in quality, regardless of input costs; and food must be produced in continuous oversupply, regardless of the fact that excessive surpluses are always sold at disastrous prices. In other words, the concept of agricultural production denies producers the right to price their products. I hasten to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any product produced in surplus and offered for sale in excess of normal markets must run the peril of securing sales by selling at lower-than-cost prices. This is true whether it