

The Altona operation does exhibit a common characteristic of voluntary pools. Outside buyers make one time buys at the top of the market, and that reverberates throughout the system and leaves the pool buying the residual. Mr. Sarsons states that the CSP pool "does not work very well" and would be a poor model for rapeseed marketing. The cost of operating the pool is not allocated or reported back to producers but is part of the overhead of that plant seed buying program.

Some 50 years later, after Mr. Stewart and Mr. Riddell reported, the rapeseed marketing commission remained convinced that voluntary pools could operate alongside the open market. The commission reported that despite the history of voluntary pools, voluntary pooling for rapeseed would benefit producers by reducing marketing risks and possibly raising prices by strengthening producers' bargaining powers with the domestic crushers and upgrading marketing skills. At the same time, the commission warned that the only practical possibility for large volume pooling is a prairiewide pool. They gave as reasons the difficulty in showing results comparable to the open market and the necessity to subsidize pools to meet competitive levels. The committee felt that elevator companies which could operate pools would not do so, because they feared getting into price wars with competing pools. That would force them to cross-subsidize and enforce delivery under contract.

Besides this single agency voluntary pool, the commission evaluated a compulsory pooling through the Wheat Board and found it would not suffer from the problems of enforcement. Mr. Speaker, two years later the pressure for such a compulsory pool resulted in the pool producer marketing referendum. As if the deck was not stacked well enough in the beginning of that referendum, and as the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) said, at the height of that campaign on the referendum for rapeseed marketing the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board announced that, if producers would not vote for a compulsory pool, he would bring in enabling legislation for voluntary pools. If that is not influence peddling of the first order, I have never seen any. If that is not a direct intervention by a spokesman for the government, in what was supposed to be an open and democratic vote, I have never seen one. If that was not an attempt to influence the vote, I have never seen one.

The evidence and the history is irrefutable. The size of rapeseed production in Canada related to the total world production of oilseeds is so small that unless you have one single pooling you cannot amount to very much in the world market for oilseeds. It makes more sense to have rapeseed under the Canadian Wheat Board with a pooling arrangement being compulsory, the same as it is for wheat, oats and barley. In that kind of a situation it would make more sense, considering our position in competition with other oilseeds. It would make more sense to have rapeseed under a single pool under the Canadian Wheat Board than it would to have wheat, oats and barley.

The logic and the reasoning of the minister and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) escapes me completely. I can understand the whole philosophy

Canadian Wheat Board Act

behind this bill, but my philosophy is the opposite of theirs. The philosophy behind this bill is to do nothing more than shore up the so-called free enterprise open market system. If that free enterprise open market system is so good, I do not understand why the official opposition would even ask for a 90 per cent guarantee of initial payments against the pool-proceeds. They have been telling us for years that the open and free market system is the best and cannot be beaten. They have been telling us it will work best for the farmer and it will save him. Then they turn around with the other hand out, like a typical free enterpriser—the greatest welfare bums in the country—wanting a 90 per cent guarantee from the government on that free enterprise open market voluntary pool. If that is not trying to have it both ways, I have never seen it.

If the minister attempts to legislate compulsion into a voluntary pool, then he is in for a lot of trouble and so are his friends in the official opposition who support him in this legislation. If the minister thinks he can use the Canadian Wheat Board, which does not believe it can operate a voluntary rapeseed pool under this legislation, I will bet you a dollar to a hole in a doughnut that they will not operate a voluntary rapeseed pool unless the minister interferes with the operations of the board and makes them do it.

For the minister in this legislation to use the Canadian Wheat Board, its accounting and its permit books as a weapon over farmers who volunteer into the pool and as a method of making it compulsory for them to stay in the pool, surely smacks of some kind of hypocrisy, even from a free enterpriser. I do not believe a voluntary pool can work with the provisions in this bill. The history of voluntary pools has been so sad and so painful both to grain producers and to governments over the last 50 years that one would have thought the hon. minister and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain would have learned a lesson from history for a change. Yet they still blindly, insensitively and ignorantly try to continue down a path which has been proven to be bad and proven to be the wrong road to take. Surely the Official Opposition will join us in saying, "Look, leave our rapeseed producers alone in the free and open market, which the majority of them voted for, or put the whole thing under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board and quit trying to horse around with half measures". They should quit trying to have it both ways. It will not work. It can only harm the whole principle of orderly marketing. This is nothing more than another attempt to bring orderly marketing into disrepute, to weaken the Canadian Wheat Board and to lessen its strength in the marketplace of the world on behalf of our Canadian grain producers.

● (2140)

I am appalled that hon. members in the Official Opposition can get to their feet and blithely and blandly agree to this legislation, saying they will support it and commending the minister for it. I did not think they would ever commend the minister for anything, but when it comes to something like so-called free enterprise and an open and free market, by golly, and those chickens of a feather flock together. They are holding hands with each other. I am sure the boys in the open