

in the United States, the demand for feed grain in Europe and Japan increased. We made sales because we were removed from the pressure of the demand in the barley market. If barley, however, were under the Canadian Wheat Board the pricing system would be too rigid. The rapeseed growers are worried about the possibility of a similar situation developing in respect of rapeseed.

Rapeseed is in severe competition with other oil seeds. With the selling system we have today there is a demand for the product. We know the supply and we know the demand. The Canadian Wheat Board is aware of the supply situation. It knows how many million bushels are in the elevators across Canada, at the Lakehead, at Vancouver and at Churchill, but the board must be more sensitive to the demand. It knows the supply situation but sales cannot be made unless we have the two factors at work, supply and demand. The rapeseed producers fear, if rapeseed is placed under the Canadian Wheat Board, that because of the inflexibility of the board's structure there might be a tendency to hide the demand for their commodity. This commodity is in severe competition with other oil seeds. Surely every farmer in Western Canada knows this. Surely a person who comes from Saskatchewan University should know this because Saskatchewan University has done a great deal of work in developing various uses for rapeseed. They should be well aware that demand must be registered. Because of the structure of the Canadian Wheat Board there might be a slight tendency to hide the demand. Therefore there is a great reluctance on the part of the growers to have rapeseed come under the Canadian Wheat Board, with all the rigidity which is built into the system. I think perhaps this bill, along with the other two which are before the committee, will receive exhaustive study.

Before I conclude, may I say that this morning in the Agricultural Committee the spokesmen for the Canadian Wheat Board were very poorly prepared. When they were asked questions they did not have the answers. They said that they really did not think the question were within the terms of reference of this bill and so on. It would seem to me—and I come back to where I started—when you have 46,675 farmers in default on payments in respect of cash advance loans, then the committee study should encompass the whole spectrum of farming. I have never seen the representatives of the Canadian Wheat Board appear before an Agriculture Committee as poorly prepared as they were this morning. I know these are capable men. Why then did we have this situation? It must have been because of pressure from the top to release only what had to be released and no more. That is what I believe. I believe there is this pressure because the government does not want to become involved in a big debate.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member is intimating there is some direction to the officials not to release information. I should like to make it perfectly clear that there was no such direction and that all the information which was availa-

Canadian Wheat Board Act

ble and relevant was certainly made available to members.

Mr. Olson: The wrong interpretation as usual, Jack.

Mr. Horner: The Minister of Agriculture suggests a wrong interpretation as usual. I was at the committee and was questioning the witnesses. How can the minister say all the information available was given and there was no direction from the top when he was not there? He does not know what information was requested. He does not know what information was not available. At one time the annual report of the Canadian Wheat Board went before the Agriculture Committee and was given a thorough study section by section. This procedure has not been followed for the last two or three years. I wonder why. The Canadian Wheat Board hired a very able and capable writer. He can write and he can carry on a great public relations job for them. Surely, he should be able to write enough about what the Board is doing for the Canadian farmer. The minister can say that there was no direction from the top, but I am only trying to analyse why more information was not made available. As we get into the study of this bill and of the Grain Stabilization Act, all the facts must be laid on the table and must be made available. I was disappointed.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I have been a member of the Standing Committee on Agriculture for 13 years, and I was very disappointed. Officials of the Wheat Board have always been very able witnesses before that committee. They have always known their facts, and they always gave out their information clearly and freely. This morning nearly all the same men were there. I understand that the chairman is in the hospital, but I am not certain about that. However, his assistants were there. They have always been before the committee, but for some reason or other much of the information was not available. The minister said that enough pertinent information was available. That is his opinion, but surely before we pass the three bills all the information that is required regarding the operation of the Wheat Board and the sales that they are supposed to have made as well as those they have made should be made known.

In addition, the action the Canadian Wheat Board took to reduce the amount of grain in storage must be explained. I think the truth will come out that this was a direction from the top, a direction which resulted in empty elevators throughout western Canada and which forced farmers to store more grain on their farms, in this way depriving them of much ready cash. It seems to me that this Action will only force farmers off the land, and that is exactly what the government is doing.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): I want to spend a few minutes making some remarks on Bill C-238. I will be brief as the House has had before it in the last few days several different farm bills and all of us have had