

*Wheat Export Prices*

understand assistance being concentrated in one area. It has been said that \$125 million was written off in respect of Expo. This was great for Canada, but it did nothing for me or my constituents. It does not enable a family to go to the grocer and obtain a pound of coffee without paying for it. The farmers in my area cannot get their tractors out of the repair shops. Their business suddenly collapses, and some people wonder why. The banker says to him: If you cannot pay up, sell your tractor.

The government has tried to establish economic units. We thought we had economic units. If a farmer is not able to sell his grain, he does not have an economic unit. The Prime Minister has said that if the farmer does not have an economic unit the government will buy his land. Does this offer apply to a man who is unable to sell his grain?

There are on the other side of the house good Liberal backbenchers to whom constituents have opened their books and exposed their income tax returns. This is not an easy thing for people to do because their business dealings are private, but it has been done. I appeal to the government: Let us not be wishy-washy. Let us not be silly about cash advances. There has to be an injection of money into areas of the country which are worse off than others.

I have never opposed anything I believed was good for the country. If a program has been necessary for the maritimes, I have supported it. Let us not ignore the plight of the western farmer. Let us not delay taking action for political reasons, because later may be too late. If action is not taken now, Canada will lose its best farmers. This is a question of simple mathematics: if you have 1,000 acres under cultivation—this is a much greater acreage than the average farm—and a five-bushel quota, you produce 5,000 bushels, which if sold at \$1.70 a bushel amounts to \$8,500. One pays about \$2 an acre in taxes, and at least \$1,000 for fertilizers. The average farmer pays from \$1,500 to \$2,000 for fuel. If one obtained a loan of \$15,000 under the Farm Improvement Loans Act, the interest at 5 per cent is \$750, which for five years amounts to \$3,750.

In addition, a farmer has to pay for repairs to machinery; he has to have enough money on which to live; he has to pay insurance premiums and many other things. The only way one can live on a farm at this time is to send your wife, if she is healthy enough, to work off the farm so she can make some

[Mr. Korchinski.]

money in order that the family may eat. This is the seriousness of the present situation with a five-bushel quota. A \$290 million reduction in the final payment last year, compared with that of the previous year, and a reduction of \$80 million in sales this year, amounts to \$370 million. As I have said, the farmer's costs have increased.

I should now like to deal with the International Grains Arrangement. I believe I understand the situation in this regard. If under this arrangement we have not been able to produce a satisfactory deal for Canadian farmers, we had better scrap it. I asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce a question today about the International Grains Arrangement. According to the fine print of that arrangement, members of the European Economic Community are allowed to deduct from the price—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I regret very much that I have to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member may continue with the unanimous consent of the house. However, I think at this point I should remind hon. members that the Chair has been given a long list of applicants for participation in this debate; therefore, hon. members may wish not to abuse the privilege of speaking beyond their allotted time.

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**Mr. Korchinski:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the house for its indulgence. I shall finish my remarks very quickly. France is a member of the International Grains Arrangement. France is our big problem in this regard because she is a large producer and is a supporter of the price level. She has the right to subtract the cost of the freight from the gulf to the port of export and establish her price at that level. Then, France has to add the charge from Marseilles to, say, somewhere in Turkey. This is always lower than the price at the gulf. This is why France is in a preferred position, and her exports are 30 per cent higher this year. But Canada cannot benefit from the same kind of arrangement. I realize that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce does not want to reveal the fine print, but the government had better face up to the fact that Canada has had the wool pulled over its eyes once again. In fact, Australia is now doing what France is doing.