

replying to the debate I hope he will provide us with the exact figures.

I quote from *Hansard* of February 10, page 3265, as follows:

—we have the highest rate of unemployment in the western world.

We still have the highest rate of unemployment in the western world. In this situation I do not see how the House can accept this bill. How can we, when we are looking forward to a budget and to a new tax bill?

About three weeks ago I was in Three Rivers, where a quarter or half of pork was being sold at 19 cents a pound in the store and beef was selling for 39 cents a pound. How do we relate this \$100 million to that? What happened to the \$100 million last year? I am a producer, and I did not get any part of it. There was not \$100 million then, and this \$100 million will not be paid out either.

I hope that when the minister replies he will give us an honest answer, because it is time we had an honest answer in this House. When I raise a pig I may be able to sell it for 29 cents a pound. What does the fellow who raises a pig in Three Rivers get, if pork is being sold at 19 cents a pound in the store? He must be getting about 5 cents a pound. None of the \$100 million was spent in Alberta, and none of it in Quebec. I look forward to the minister's reply.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House because I see the minister is anxious to close the debate. Obviously, it will take him at least the time remaining between now and four o'clock, and probably several hours more, to answer the serious charges that have been laid against the government and himself in connection with this legislation. Therefore, I wish to give him every opportunity to answer our questions before the bill goes to committee, as I assume it will.

We do not like the bill. We think it is bad legislation. We think there is a very faint glimmer of light and hope that there is a principle involved in it which, with adequate surgery and changes, might become legislation of some value to the farmers of western Canada. So our inclination is to register our opposition to the bill in its present form and let it go on division, but to make it abundantly clear to the minister and the government that unless they are prepared to accept good amendments in the committee or at the report stage we will feel free to vote against it on third reading.

● (3:20 p.m.)

I want to make this quite plain. In our view, this bill is one of the legislative and administrative proposals advanced by the government which constitutes a form of economic genocide against the small farmers of this country and in particular the small and average farmer of western Canada. There is no doubt, in spite of what the minister said, in spite of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, and in spite of what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) said, that this government has

#### *Prairie Grain Stabilization Act*

charted a firm and definite course which can only result in depopulation of rural areas, with fiscal and other devices of this kind compelling people to move to the cities. I am not going to debate that issue, but I think the policy is wrong. Our party has taken a constant position against this kind of program. We think it is part of the legislative scheme, part of the device which the government has outlined and which it is in the process of putting through this House in order to achieve its objective.

There is a weakness and lack of pressure in connection with international wheat agreements. This government has a sad and sorry history on this issue. The minister may refer to agreements being made with this country and that country, but we must have sales of grain at an adequate price and under agreements honoured by the countries involved which will have the effect of producing sufficient revenue for the farmers of this country.

The minister was not very helpful when he followed the lead of the Prime Minister in suggesting that there was a filibuster on this bill. As he knows, when the government introduces good legislation we support it. We have not had much occasion to do this. But when the government introduces legislation which is not sound, and this party or my friends to the left feel it is bad, we will oppose it. We will oppose it to the length necessary to acquaint the people of Canada with its weaknesses and defects. This is when the government screams "filibuster" and "obstruction".

Does the government not think that we have a duty as an opposition party or as private members, whether on this side of the House or the other side, to point out the weaknesses and defects in legislative programs? Have we not a responsibility to point them out long enough so that the amber light will be flashed in the country and the people will know that they are approaching a dangerous situation brought about because of bad legislative proposals made by the government?

Let us consider the statement made by the minister when he introduced this bill. He outlined it in a comprehensive manner, dealing with the entire legislative proposal, dealing with the amendments to the Wheat Board Act which are coming in, dealing with the amendments to the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, and so on. The minister says that these are part of the whole program, that put together they are all good. I repeat, and I hope he is listening, that the government is planning a form of economic genocide for the small farmers of this country.

In order to judge the government's conduct today and its proposal for the future we must look at its record in the past. The minister talked about rapeseed and legislation coming in to deal with this question. On the question of stabilization of farm income this is tremendously important, but what is the record of this government and the Liberal party in regard to rapeseed as a means of stabilizing farm income? During the last war the then Liberal government introduced a program to encourage the growing of rapeseed in those parts of Canada suited to it. It was grown as a substitute for a marine lubricant