

Wheat Sales

least have the confidence that the increase demanded will be equal to the price obtained, at least for the next month or two. Let us have that grant immediately. Right now there are many people on special permits, people who have retired, people like the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar who probably has some rapeseed, feed barley and so on on hand. Perhaps that is why he concentrated on that aspect. The fact is, however, that there are farmers who do have some grain. We have the ridiculous suggestion that farmers are holding back grain because of income tax.

The other day I asked the minister if he would at least provide the amount of money necessary to assure these farmers that they would receive the same amount of money next year as this year in the final payment. The minister would not give that assurance. If he does not want to pay out money in storage payments, he should give that assurance here and now. He did not want to do that in the House the other day when I asked the minister to indicate whether the final payment this year will be the same as last year. I asked him, if necessary, to give at least a supplementary payment and to give an assurance to those people so that they would provide delivery. He mentioned the income tax. Unfortunately the comment I made later was not recorded in *Hansard*, namely, that the income tax is the same whether the income is received in July, in August or September which is in the next crop year. For the minister to come out with such a statement is incredible. The total annual income is calculated from January 1 to the end of December—surely even the minister knows that.

● (1710)

The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) said that he did not receive any letters from any farm organization requesting storage payments and he said "why do we have to get the minister to do something?" Obviously, the minister does not want to do anything. He does not want to come up with a storage policy. Even if he does come up with a storage policy at this late date, this would not reassure farmers. If the producer did not deliver grain at the time when the grain was needed, he would lose that storage payment which might have been an inducement for him to deliver. But the minister shies away from doing that because he is trying to save money for the Treasury. This is his so-called attempt to help the farmer.

What is he really doing? As the Liberal bible, the task force report, says, the minister is trying to get two out of three farmers off the farms. He was trying to save that money and as a result he got himself into a predicament. We had the prime minister of India, who comes from a country where they live, so to speak, from hand to mouth, a country which is in a very precarious situation coming at a time when world stocks of wheat are down to a country which is normally considered to be the bread basket of the world, and yet we cannot give her the assurance she seeks. We cannot get this minister to act.

Even the NDP will not act and will not come up with a non-confidence motion. They tell us "don't you dare" because it will embarrass them. That is the trouble. Since when is it wrong to give the farmers 30 cents over and above what they have been receiving? The minister announced a 30 cent payment last year on October 15, two

weeks before the election. It was not wrong then. He was pretty brave at that time. Brave or not, he was going to sink or swim, do or die. Do or die Otto. He said "we will give them 30 cents and we will see what happens". Do you know how safe he was? On July 8, the United States had signed a deal with Russia.

Mr. Lang: At \$1.63.

Mr. Korchinski: It does not matter what the price was, but let me tell the House what happened. As a result of that sale, the price went up from \$1.57 to \$1.90 in the world market. The price went up 33 cents, yet the minister handed out only 30 cents. Now, you see how careful he was. Even though the world price had gone up by 33 cents, he was not confident enough so he slipped the farmers only 30 cents.

I have here a report which I have not checked out today but it mentions the price of wheat as \$3.40. We are asking for 30 cents over and above \$1.76, which brings it up to \$2.06. That is all. Will that break the Treasury, or is the Minister admitting that the price at which farmers have been selling is so low that perhaps the Treasury may have to put out one or two cents. Is that his concern? Perhaps he is afraid that farmers will make a few dollars, and then he will not be able to remove two out of three farmers immediately.

The motion before us is quite proper. In the Standing Committee on Agriculture the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) asked the pointblank question as to whether we are losing sales. The answer came in a very positive way that we could be making more sales if we had more grain. The prime minister of India was here the other day. This supports my contention. If we did not at this time put forward a non-confidence motion, we would be abdicating our responsibility.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: I think I could survive.

Mr. Korchinski: Several years ago the minister, in a headlong attempt to follow the bible of the Liberal party, the Liberal philosophy, reduced the number of farmers. The party over there forgets that every year we have about 40 million to 50 million more people to feed in the world. Yet, he wants to reduce the number of elevators to about 40 or 50. He said in a speech several years ago that that is all we need. He has tunnel vision, if anyone has. He is following the policy which he announced in a speech he made five or six years ago, and now he is determined not to change his mind. Had he pursued a proper course when he could manipulate the grain out of a commercial position, he would not now be in this situation. But he did not do so because he was determined to get rid of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act and bring in the abortive stabilization bill. He was blundering. Even at this late date, he refuses our requests. I suspect that he will refuse all suggestions. He thinks he is right; he thinks that things will correct themselves.

He had evidence of what was going to happen here some time ago. As early as August 15 of last year there was an article in the *Globe and Mail* entitled "A Time for Reflection in the Grain Trade". It was an interesting article, and