

Wheat Board report. The Canadian Wheat Board also issued a press release in which Mr. Treleaven, assistant chief commissioner of the board, said that with one exception all countries contracting to buy wheat from Canada had fully lived up to their agreements. There is an article entitled "Default charges denied" in the *Manitoba Co-operator* of May 13, 1971. When I raised the question in the House I was merely seeking clarification in asking the minister to comment on these various outstanding contracts. I did not use the word "default"; I used the word "outstanding", and I covered the majority of them.

I ask the minister this question: If these various countries have lived up to the terms of their agreement, why then in the case of the U.S.S.R. did we have to go through a renegotiation of the contract? Why was it, with respect to the People's Republic of China, that amendments were made to the long-term agreement? Why was it, with respect to Bulgaria, that the entire quantity contracted for remained outstanding and a new contract was written up? Why was it that a three-year agreement with Poland for 33.1 million bushels, which was due to expire on November 4, 1969, was extended to July 31, 1971? Why is a long-term agreement with the Democratic Republic of Germany still outstanding? Why was the contract with the Philippines, which was due to expire on August 30, 1969, extended to September 30, 1971? Why was it that the contract with the United Arab Republic was not entirely filled?

If it is true that these countries lived up to the terms of their agreements, one then must ask the minister to tell us whether it is because Canada has not been able to deliver in sufficient quantities the kind of grain that was bargained for. I am not playing politics; I am merely seeking clarification.

**Mr. Lang:** Read on.

• (8:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Yes, I have been quoting. These are some of the things we want the government to deal with. I see the minister shaking his head. I am merely quoting from the Canadian Wheat Board report. I hope it is clarified without any fanfare. We have a situation which I believe warrants clarification. The Canadian Wheat Board certainly is not to be treated as a sacred cow. I believe it has some blemishes and I think this is the place to air them.

Now I should like to turn to the question of rapeseed. The rapeseed industry in Canada has been one of the most successful and has contributed to the survival of the grains industry in western Canada. I believe its success is owed in great part to the ingenuity and talent of Mr. Jim McAnsh who is the executive director of the Rapeseed Association of Canada. I am sure the minister will be consulting this gentleman and the association because they have some very explicit fears about the inclusion of these grains under the jurisdiction of the Canadian

### *Canadian Wheat Board Act*

Wheat Board. I should like to quote from the *Free Press Weekly* of May 15 which quotes Mr. McAnsh as follows:

He fears that the threat alone may have curtailed interest in the rapeseed market and could have contributed to recent depression of prices in Winnipeg futures.

"We will not be assured that the spectacular growth and development of the rapeseed industry in Canada will continue until we are able to fully determine the scope and intent of the proposed changes," said Mr. McAnsh.

The article continues:

"The Rapeseed Association of Canada, which was brought into existence four years ago to promote and expand markets for Canadian rapeseed, while comprising all segments of the industry, includes in its membership roster a preponderance of rapeseed producers.

I reiterate that there are a large number of rapeseed producers included in this association. I believe it has become abundantly clear that the Canadian Wheat Board is too far removed from the producers' interest at the present time. There is no direct producer representation other than through the advisory board. I think it is very important that the producers themselves become closer to the marketing facilities. The article reads further:

By working shoulder to shoulder with the grain trade, processors, and grain handling companies, including the producer-owned companies, what was so recently a struggling industry has exploded into one of the most promising enterprises in western Canada," said Mr. McAnsh.

It continues:

A number of Canada's overseas customers have registered their protests regarding the proposed changes and do not appear to be completely reassured by the repeated statements by the minister that no change in the marketing system for rapeseed is contemplated at this time. Some importers of Canadian rapeseed who have been making forward contracts into the first quarter of 1972, are believed to have withdrawn from the market," concluded Mr. McAnsh.

Then we find these words:

As a cash crop that could be marketed and sold, rapeseed has been a lifesaver when other grain crops (primarily wheat) filled the producers' bins to the bursting point and apparently couldn't be marketed.

When asked whether governments should become involved in commodity promotion, Mr. McAnsh, the rapeseed executive, replied in a very definite and categorical way, "No". I believe we have been very successful in penetrating the market. Certainly I do not see any reason for trying to disrupt it at the present time. A number of producer groups feel very much the same way. I do not believe we should provoke any further apprehension. I think that before the legislation is proceeded with something firm must be stated by the minister concerning the manner in which he proposes to determine whether this measure has the support of the producers. We could then deal with the legislation in a much more expeditious manner.

I should like to quote a comment made by Mr. C. P. Kokott, secretary of the UGG local board in Lavoy, Alberta, which happens to be in my constituency. He refers to an annual meeting held on April 22 at which a