

Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act

expected. I expected he would eventually relate what he was saying to the bill now before the House. I will take both aspects of the matter under consideration.

Mr. Lang: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to deal with the wanderings of the hon. member, but he indicated that he thought I understood what he was talking about. I would like it to be known that neither I nor anyone else understood what he was talking about.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to join in that kind of argument with the minister. I am going to treat it with the kind of contempt it deserves. With reference to the remarks made by Your Honour, I will abide by them. As far as the case is concerned, I was careful to stay on the line in that regard. I was not dealing with what judgment may come down from the Supreme Court of Canada. I was asking who will represent the federal government, what province counsel will be from and what his instructions will be in representing the national interest.

I repeat so that I will make myself clear to everyone, including the minister, that if this problem were settled he would not have to take the taxpayers' money to subsidize the farmers. There would be a cash flow on the farm if there were a market for goods and free trade among the provinces.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: If that is not relevant, nothing is relevant in this whole debate.

Mr. Lang: Are you opposed to this bill?

Mr. Woolliams: I am not opposed to the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, because it was our party that brought in cash advances.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: When our party brought in the cash advances, C. D. Howe said they would never work. The whole Liberal party voted against cash advances when they came before the House. I ask the minister to check that statement.

I would like to deal with the problems of the Minister of Agriculture. He will not come to grips with the real problems of the farmers. The same is true, as I said the other night, about the Minister of Agriculture who has climbed up the political ladder wrong by wrong by wrong. He has climbed from Social Credit to socialism by slickness and slyness. He will not accept the responsibility of seeing that there is a free flow of goods and produce from province to province.

I understand that in Alberta leaflets are being distributed in the minister's constituency. I would be surprised if this man who has climbed the political ladder wrong by wrong by wrong, from Social Credit to socialism by slickness and slyness, could even return to his own constituency.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth is rising on a point of order.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Some hon. Members: Hoot, hoot!

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, these personal attacks on the minister are unparliamentary. I submit that they are completely out of order.

Mr. Woolliams: There is one thing about my good friends. They always manage to say that the argument is not relevant. For an irrelevant argument, I have never seen an argument get under their skins so quickly. They know that everything I say is true. As far as this bill is concerned, they are trying to cover up the destitution and poverty that exists on the farms.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: To make it even worse, the Minister of Justice has joined the Minister of Agriculture: the Minister of Justice has climbed the political ladder from Cambridge to constitutional inaccuracies, to anti-confederation. This is the true position of these men. I do not need to say any more; I have made my point. But I want to repeat—

Mr. Pepin: Go ahead, repeat.

Mr. Woolliams: Will the distinguished gentleman please bear with me? He is a man not gifted with words; he does not use them often.

Mr. Pepin: Let's have a repeat.

Mr. Woolliams: If the government wants to get this farm legislation through it will have to come to grips with the problem that I have mentioned and stop sweeping it under the carpet. Then this debate on agriculture would soon come to an end. It is no answer to say in this debate or the debates that will take place on the other two bills that Bill C-176 will be the answer. That bill is also unconstitutional. If the government does not think so, why does it not make a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada?

● (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to say that I do not think we should refer this bill back. I say this because of the situation which exists in the Prairie region. I agree with the previous speaker—

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Gleave: Why not?

An hon. Member: Because he is wrong.

Mr. Gleave: What he said was correct in some respects. When he told us Mr. C. D. Howe had said this type of legislation was impossible, he was correct. I know that, because I was around at the time. When the succeeding government put the legislation into effect, changes in the act made it less effective than it should have been. As a matter of fact, it worked hardship because farmers sold their crops in advance and were charged in the following year in respect of the advances they had received. Nevertheless, I do not think this bill should be referred back. We ought to correct what is wrong with the present