

Canadian Wheat Board Act

may believe, deliveries can be made on any particular day a farmer may choose. He can pick up the phone at any time and say "I think the price is right, now". But delivery must be made to the crusher in order that it may continue production. Can hon. members imagine shutting down a plant for two months in the middle of winter—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): One o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I was commenting on the fact that the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) had destroyed his own argument about excluding the three grains, rapeseed, rye and flaxseed, from the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board since on his own initiative he said he had made \$500 on a carload of rapeseed that he had shipped, and which every farmer is on his own initiative entitled to emulate, requestion the railways to spot a car for him. Having made his \$500, the hon. member should not deny other farmers the same privilege. However, there will come a time when the hon. member will not make \$500, but will lose a few hundred. In other words, the averaging principle still applies. All that the Wheat Board really does is to average out the quantity delivered by farmers. The farmers deliver their grain to someone else and take their money at the end of the year. They are not concerned about the price at the moment of delivery; rather the initiative is left to another group of people, who may or may not make the right decision.

The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar did make the right decision to sell at that particular time at that particular price. I have already mentioned the fact that a farmer within 20 miles of me made \$2.92 on some rapeseed, as of course he was entitled to do. But is it of any comfort to the farmers to know that the wheat pool does all this for them, adding on the delivery charges and the whole cost of the operation? Or is it of greater comfort to the farmers to know that on their own initiative they are able to reveal in many instances the weaknesses of the present system?

If the farmers leave things entirely to the Wheat Board, they come to think that the Board is equivalent to the Almighty, that it is just like belonging to the Roman Catholic church. I happen to be a Roman Catholic myself, but whatever the Roman Catholic church does is perfectly all right. You do not deny the church. However, many people are trying to change the system. Many people are trying to change the Wheat Board or the wheat pool and to come up with a better system. If it is all right to challenge something as sacred as religion then it should be perfectly all right to challenge the Wheat Board system. This is exactly what has happened. No one, except the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) has suggested for one moment that we must use the Wheat Board because it is sacred. He said if we put everything under the Wheat Board, things would run smoothly.

• (1410)

The hon. member gave an example of how he had received \$500 on a carload he delivered. I am prepared to give an example of a farmer who received \$800. On his own initiative he asked for a car, spotted the car at his own delivery point and delivered to Vancouver. He went through the whole process. At the same time he pinpointed the date at which he would sell the grain. In other words, there are arguments for and against. I shall not dwell in that further, except to point out that there are many examples of this.

I do not think the Wheat Board system is necessarily advantageous. It blinds one to what actually happens. The \$500 which the hon. member received could have been more. He does not know this. He is blinded to the fact that there is a system working against him. The hon. member wants the Wheat Board to do everything for him. He admits that on his own initiative he made himself \$500. I believe his approach to the whole problem is rather stupid. The Canadian farmer needs a more realistic approach. The hon. member did the right thing, but then he said he wanted the same privilege for everybody else. Nonsense! People are not prepared to share anything with anybody else unnecessarily. The point is that if necessary, others share with the hungry, the needy and so on, but in this case a man struggles for his own existence. If we were speaking of a farming industry which was flourishing, that would be fine and dandy, but this industry is not in that situation.

I shall not dwell any further on this point. The hon. member is not very realistic in respect of his motion. The committee had been asked to interview witnesses, and yet we never had an opportunity to do so. There are persons who may have expressed opinions different from mine who might have convinced me to agree with them. I have bent this way and that. The minister knows very well I have been quite flexible in most of my dealings with him, in an effort to accommodate him. My original position at that time was that if we withdrew this particular clause, the bill could be passed. One does not face reality if he suggests at this particular time that the Wheat Board is the final solution to the problem. Barley is selling for 90 cents a bushel to the feeders in the area of Saskatoon and yet the Wheat Board is buying it for 65 cents a bushel. Who is a stupid fool! The farmers are not delivering their barley.

Mr. Lang: They are.

Mr. Korchinski: The minister is making a vain attempt to prove his point. The farmers are catching on to the fact that it was sold at a very low price, and that they will be able to obtain a better price within a year. I challenge the minister to tell me this is not a fact. Will he rise at this particular time and say it will not be sold at a higher price?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the hon. member whether he is aware of the fact that barley deliveries on the prairies have been running at around 20 million bushels as of the past week and this is something of an all-time record.