

about the Canadian Wheat Board would stand in his place and defend a strong Canadian Wheat Board. The NDP, on the other hand, has tried to indicate that somehow or other the Conservatives were out to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have heard this kind of talk again and again in the House.

● (1620)

When I ran in the riding of Assiniboia, I recall very clearly that in local newspaper ads one of the first points was a strong Canadian Wheat Board. Anyone who knows the history of the Prairies in the dirty thirties can go back to the time before the inception of the Canadian Wheat Board when there were some very difficult periods for farmers. Certainly prairie farmers depend on the Canadian Wheat Board, a strong Canadian Wheat Board. This is not to suggest that the Canadian Wheat Board has made no mistake. At times there have been questions and certainly there must continue to be improvements. However, this motion deals with the ability of the Administrator to undermine the Canadian Wheat Board. In part it reads:

—the Administrator do not restrict the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board under the Canadian Wheat Board Act to make available the quantities and types of grain necessary to achieve sales commitments on behalf of, and in the interests of producers.

The objectives of our Party are very clear. We have taken a balanced approach to the Bill and to the amendments we have put forward. We have made it clear in our amendments that we want a freeze, particularly relating to increased freight rates which farmers cannot afford. While we have made it clear that this is a bad Bill, at the same time we have tried to do everything possible and in the best interests of producers to have our amendments address problems faced by farmers and certainly serve in their best interests.

Motion No. 39 does exactly that. It speaks out and says that the Administrator does not restrict the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board. I would be very surprised if in the next few minutes I do not see Members of the New Democratic Party standing in their places and saying exactly the opposite. I want it clearly on the record that Motion No. 39 standing in my name indicates the direction of the Progressive Conservative Party.

Another important factor alluded to in the last paragraph of the motion is, "to achieve sales commitments on behalf of, and in the interests of producers". One problem producers and farmers will face in the near future will be competition in the international marketplace. The motion clearly indicates that the Administrator would in no way interfere with the best interests of primary producers. We talked in committee and in the House particularly about the types of subsidies granted by different countries around the world. These will certainly have an impact upon sales commitments. Also we talked about the subsidies granted by the European common market, by the United States of America and by countries like Japan and the Pacific Rim countries, which will create a special challenge. We believe the Canadian Wheat Board is up to this challenge, but in no way do we want restrictions on the part of the Administrator.

### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

The wording in Motion No. 39 reads, "on behalf of, and in the interest of producers". We in the Progressive Conservative Party have displayed in our amendments a keen awareness of the situation on the Prairies. First is the ability to pay. Today I raised in the House the fact that the Minister had increased the initial price of barley but failed to do what he should have done, that is, increase the initial price of wheat, hard red wheat which is selling at 90 cents per bushel more today at Thunder Bay and Durum which is selling at \$1.60 per bushel more at Thunder Bay than what farmers are receiving. The Minister is not acting in the best interests of primary producers. Here we have \$1 per bushel which farmers cannot get their hands on. While it might be safe to say there is some flexibility, the truth of the matter is that farmers, particularly young farmers, are paying very high interest rates on money borrowed from the banks. Farmers' money is being held by the Government for a period of time, money which could be a source of cash flow they desperately need.

Another example would be western grain stabilization. There is \$860 million in a fund which could be paid out to farmers, if the Government and the Minister had the will to make some slight changes in the direction of their administration. Motion No. 39 deals exactly with that type of direction. It allows the Canadian Wheat Board to act in the best interests of producers. It is important that this be done. This is why I am pleased to rise in my place and put forward this motion. I hope the NDP will support it, not misinterpret it and try to go the full cycle and be on both sides of the fence. I hope Members of that Party do not try to create the contortion they have in the past.

I see Mr. Speaker is rising. Is my time up?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** May the Hon. Member continue with unanimous consent of the House?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**An Hon. Member:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There does not appear to be unanimous consent.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Mr. Speaker, I compliment the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson) on his motion. I suspect it is not his fault that it is in the wrong place and is insufficiently worded. His motion and mine attempt, in a slightly different way, to accomplish the same objective.

I find it interesting that the Tories want a regulator regulating another regulator, namely the Canadian Wheat Board. They support the idea that the Administrator can put sanctions on the Canadian Wheat Board. In the next breath, the Hon. Member for Assiniboia comes up with his motion, all for motherhood and against sin, in favour of the Canadian Wheat Board.

● (1630)

The Hon. Member made the mistake of using the word "contortion". The Tories have exercised all of the proverbial