

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, might I raise a point of order affecting the members of this House. Before the order designated for consideration today having to do with the appropriation bill is called, I wonder whether we could agree to deal with order No. 21 to send the annual report of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to the committee. I understand agreement has been reached and that this can be done now without debate.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

MOTION TO REFER ANNUAL REPORT TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development), moved:

That the annual report of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for the year ended March 31, 1972, tabled January 22, 1973, be referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Firth: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to express my agreement with this action, since it is a matter that is very important to me. I am very happy that this action has been taken.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

SUPPLY

APPROPRIATION ACT No. 1, 1973

The House resumed, from Monday, February 12, consideration in committee of Bill C-141, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1973—Mr. Drury—Mr. McCleave in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. House again in committee of the whole on Bill C-141, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1973. When the committee rose last evening votes 15a and 40a of the schedule relating to agriculture were under consideration.

On clause 2—*Schedule*.

Mr. Horner (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Chairman, I should first like to clarify for the members on the government side, both NDP and Liberals, what Conservative policy is regarding the marketing of rapeseed. I am really quite surprised they do not know immediately what our policy would be. Since we believe that the individual is intelligent and should be allowed to make up his own

Supply

mind on these matters, and since we do not believe in rule by experts, as do the NDP and the Liberals, naturally this is a decision that the rapeseed growers will have to determine for themselves, and we would welcome a plebiscite on the matter.

Mr. Gleave: Why didn't you vote for it last year?

Mr. Horner (Battleford-Kindersley): Personally, I would be inclined to let the Wheat Board handle it provided the Wheat Board could be changed somewhat; I shall develop that point a little later. Otherwise, I would caution farmers not to enter such an arrangement on a permanent basis. I know that a lot of people in Winnipeg would be happy to see the Wheat Board handle rapeseed, especially those who do very well on barley.

I was quite surprised to hear the Minister of Justice, the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, accuse the NDP yesterday of having the philosophy that the experts ought to tell the producers what to do. I was pleased to hear him say that because, having taken a look at all the reports he has received from the experts and read some of the conclusions in those reports, it is reassuring to know that the minister himself does not do everything the experts tell him to do.

I am concerned with some of the conclusions the experts have drawn in regard to matters of grain handling, trucking and transportation. A lot of these reports were prepared at tremendous expense to the taxpayer, and some of them are dated in 1970. They reached the Parliamentary Library last Wednesday. Apparently it is all right for the minister to have them two and a half years ago but M.P.'s have to wait for them.

I have just gone over the reports quickly, so if I happen to make a mistake I think I should be forgiven by the minister. It is of interest to note that the criteria used by these experts do not relate to any social repercussions there may be in western Canada, and in this regard I think the people of western Canada should be alerted. From listening to many of the minister's speeches recently, it appears to me he is leaning toward a change in the grain hauling system at the 70 inland terminals, something that upsets me very much.

A lot of people have come to the conclusion that the grain industry is labour-intensive and there must be a cut in the number of people employed in that industry. I suppose they have in mind sending them into government programs and projects which would retrain them for something else. We are already losing one seat in Saskatchewan and another in Manitoba, and we now have a report that recommends a reduction in the number of people employed in this particular industry.

One of the factors not considered in these studies was the tremendous contribution made by a lot of the grain growers to rural life in small towns in Saskatchewan. I think the minister is in real danger of being unaware of the realities of life because he stepped straight from school into the cabinet and perhaps cannot appreciate what is involved here. It has been said that the grain handling system was subject to inflation. I do not know what is not subject to inflation these days. One report says that the over-all cost of marketing grain today is 42.9 cents a bushel, and that if we adopted the inland terminal