

might well be ultra vires in respect of the Canadian Wheat Board Act which is of course federal and not provincial legislation. A worsening situation has been brought about today by the fact that today the cash crops being produced on the farms are confined to the jurisdiction of the provinces in which they are produced.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The minister was asking questions and I have just been handed figures regarding cash income from grain in Saskatchewan. These figures are from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. In Saskatchewan, grain income in 1967 was \$737 million; in 1968, it was \$655 million; in 1969, it was \$495 million; and in 1970, it was \$449 million. I say to the minister that from the figures that are now being given out, it is obvious that the exports of wheat overseas have declined. He will find those figures to be correct. If I am wrong, I will sit down and he can correct me. He should compare those figures with figures in other years. Those are figures for both export and domestic sales. If they are higher, then why are we not moving the grain off the farms?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Is the minister rising for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the hon. member is aware of the fact that wheat exports are running very heavily ahead of last year, and is he aware of the fact that the total grain exports are now somewhere over the 500 million bushel mark, which means that with two months to run we are ahead of any but the four best years, all of which we almost certainly will pass? Also, I wonder whether the hon. member is aware of the fact that while such quotas as the rapeseed quota are at the 30 bushel level, barley is also at the 30 bushel level and wheat is at the five or six bushel level. This means that a straight wheat farmer who has a quota on all his acres has a much higher total delivery quota than he has had for several years.

Mr. Woolliams: I must quote the figures to the minister—

Mr. Osler: You do not understand them.

Mr. Woolliams: I think I understand them. I thought the hon. member was more patient than that, even if he is sucking his thumb.

Mr. Osler: No, I was scratching my chin.

Mr. Woolliams: If what the minister said is true, may I bring something to his attention. Hon members have noticed how carefully he uses the word "grain" instead of wheat in order, as the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) pointed out, to hide facts. If he is correct in his assertions, I challenge him to explain why gross income from grain in Saskatchewan alone dropped from \$737 million in 1967 down to \$449 million in 1970, a loss of almost \$300 million. Either he is selling grain at fire sale prices or else the exports have declined. He cannot have it both ways. The figures I quote are from the DBS.

Canadian Wheat Board Act

I do not blame the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) for having two fingers in his mouth now. I would feel the same way if my minister were throwing figures around. I can imagine how badly members from eastern provinces feel when they know what is happening in Saskatchewan. I say through you, Mr. Speaker, that this government is in such disrepute today that the minister does not dare cross provincial borders, let alone allow grain to cross them.

Mr. Osler: Coming as I do from western Canada, I am scratching my chin in wonderment.

Mr. Woolliams: I know. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre wonders at the minister being so ill-informed about grain, particularly since his constituency was the home of the grain exchange. He will have to do a little visiting. I should like to ask the minister, before I sit down, whether, when he used the word "grain" he meant wheat, or did he mean grain. Let him look at his notes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair is wondering whether this procedure can be followed. I do not see how the hon. member speaking can ask a question of the minister. If the minister wants to ask a question of the member who has the floor, the hon. member would have to decide whether to allow the question. I do not think the Chair can allow this kind of exchange from one side of the House to the other because, according to the rules of the House, a member is entitled to speak only once at this stage of the debate. I do not see how the minister, who is not permitted to seek the floor to take part in the debate, may be allowed to reply to a question put by the hon. member.

Mr. Lang: May I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The minister is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Woolliams: That is different; I do not mind hearing the point of order.

Mr. Lang: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; I was rising on the assumption that after 18 members had spoken I would in fact, take the opportunity to reply, which I know would close the debate, and I was waiting for you to say no.

Mr. Woolliams: I will conclude with the following remarks. This just shows how factual the minister was. He deliberately used the word "grain" knowing that most people think of grain as being wheat. The two words are synonymous in people's minds. The minister hoped he could cover up the facts when I pointed out that exports had decreased. I say to him again that I challenge him to say that the figures for the export and domestic consumption of wheat equal those in 1966, 1967, 1968 or 1969, on the average. That is what we are interested in.

I want to drive home one more point. The minister has been talking about the great exports of grain. I have not received an answer to my question. If the minister is interested, I will go to Saskatoon with him and I will drive 200 or 300 miles through the grain belts with him.