

## Supply—Agriculture

had an annual net worth gain of approximately \$6,700. This man farms a section, and if he had 600 acres cultivated and if he were able to market a 7-bushel quota for wheat, he would be able to market 4,500 bushels, the return from which would total less than \$6,000. Obviously, therefore, there is some gross error in the submission this gentleman has made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have waited for the government to place its position on deficiency payments before this committee. We have waited for an announcement by the government as well on the presentation made by the mass delegation. We have not had an announcement from the government as to what its position will be. However, we have had some very disturbing statements in this house and over the radio by members of parliament representing prairie constituencies. The Conservative members representing prairie constituencies have been saying that they are opposed to deficiency payments. They are now holding up their hands.

**Mr. Horner (Acadia):** That is not true at all.

**Mr. Argue:** We are hearing from the Horner brothers now. I hold in my hand a copy of the *Western Producer* for April 23, containing a very sharp castigation of the hon. member for Jasper-Edson for the ill-conceived and inaccurate speech he made in this chamber some time ago.

**Mr. Horner (Acadia):** And inaccurately reported.

**Mr. Argue:** Western Canada today is being betrayed by members of parliament of the Conservative party who represent them, in that they are opposed to the legitimate requests that have been made by the mass delegation.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I must advise him that his time has expired.

**Mr. Nasserden:** In rising to take part in this debate today I will speak on that most controversial issue, how best to take care of the delicate situation which has been presented to those engaged in the grain growing industry in western Canada during the past several years. In doing so I should like to make a comment on what has been said concerning the conduct of members of this house from western Canada. No one has betrayed the western farmer more than those who during the years, not only this session but in past parliaments for the last 10 or 12 years, have taken stands in parliament that were so far from what the western Canadian farmer wanted that they engendered ill-will from the other parts of this nation.

Now, in approaching this situation I should like to take you back to a statement made by the late Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King toward the end of the last war, to the effect that if the new order that was to emerge was not already well on the way before the cessation of hostilities, we might well look for it in vain. Those words were often repeated by the late Mr. King and by Liberal members in the House of Commons in order to set them above all others in their appreciation of the need for action. These words, spoken by the late revered leader of those who now form the opposition in parliament, are eloquent of the position in which the western Canadian farmer found himself prior to the election of 1957.

The Liberal party not only failed to recognize the increasing spread between costs and returns to farmers in the grain growing area, but they even went so far as to lower the initial price of oats by about 5 cents a bushel at a time when farm costs in western Canada were rising as they had never risen before. They took this action notwithstanding the fact that they had given lip service to a price support program under the old prices support legislation. They were so blind to the problems of the western grain grower that even during the election of 1958 they tried to bribe the grain grower with 10 cents of his own money by promising to raise the initial price of wheat by 10 cents per bushel. Anyone who wants to talk about insults can remember that one.

Last year this government moved to recognize the difficult income position of western grain growers. The provision of the acreage payment plan was not the result of neglect, nor was it the result of an unsympathetic consideration of that problem. Indeed, its very terms gave emphasis to the immediate needs of those to whom this government pledged to provide long term legislation. If I may be permitted to say that the \$200 payment was not regarded as sufficient to meet the losses of prairie grain growers, I hope western Canadian grain growers will remember that if the former government had been alive to their needs, as was this government, they would have received something like \$1,000 since 1953 when the situation was first actively recognized.

I took the stand last year, and I see no reason to change it now, that the people of my constituency want a policy that will last into the future. They know, as do the members of this house, that if we, as the governing party, were to go back and endeavour to rectify by cash grants or payments all the