

ally dwindle into insignificance until, in the final year 1962-63, only 15 million bushels of barley were exported. Yet these are the people who say that we should be aggressive sellers. Mr. Speaker, the first thing we did was to say to the Canadian Wheat Board, "We will guarantee you credit as you sell grain throughout the world. We will assist you with a partial payment of interest if you have to reduce interest rates when you are selling to developing countries."

With that kind of help they moved into markets like Syria and Egypt, where they had never been previously, and back into Brazil, the Phillipines, and Peru where they had not been for years. That is the kind of action that contributed to record sales last year.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear hear.

**Mr. Lang:** We were also being told by some observers, some of the experts, that there was no real place for Canadian feed grain in the markets of the world. We said that need not be so. We said to the Canadian Wheat Board, "You go out with all the vigour you can, and look for a barley market." They have gone after that market. In the very first year of doing so our exports went up to 84 million bushels, and last year moved up to 172 million bushels.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear hear.

**Mr. Lang:** We need to be in the feed grain markets of the world, and we expect to assist in the additional research necessary to improve that grain or to develop other grains in order to keep ourselves in the forefront of those markets. For this reason, there was recently announced the establishment of the Crop Research Institute at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon to augment, as a result of fundamental support from the National Research Council, research into the kind of grain which can be grown for better markets in the world. At the same time, we set up the market development fund as a sales weapon leading to a flexible approach to selling which will allow us to support Canadian businesses wanting to go into flour milling or rapeseed milling abroad. By doing that, perhaps they can assure a better access to the market for Canadian grain and lead to a future of greater sales.

● (9:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** What about wheat and the law? That is the question.

**Mr. Lang:** In the case of the handling and transportation system, we have launched a vigorous series of studies into the changes that may be necessary. We refused to sit still and say that it is a dangerous question to touch. I say that if there is a way to say to the prairie farmer that he can save a significant amount of money, I want to get at the facts even if the gloom and doom sayers over there will spread threats and notions of disaster from the very fact that we are trying to do something to make it possible for the prairie grain farmer to market his grain at lower cost. What we have said in connection with the studies, how this present

#### *Withholding of Grain Payments*

handling system works and how alternatives can work—alternatives like cleaning more grain on the Prairies and shipping it to the coast by unit train—we have said in connection with those studies, and the government has taken the policy decision, that any change which could be made in that direction should be made only with the full support of the producers. We have also said that when such change is made the bulk of benefit must be allowed to go back to the producers. We said that in favour of the prairie farmer in terms of his grain deliveries—

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** This is all irrelevant to the question.

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-244 will shortly be before the House again. When it is, I ask hon. members opposite to look at it fairly and to allow us full time to pass that bill and get the \$100 million into the hands of the farmers.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear hear!

**Mr. Lang:** There is no doubt, and there never has been any doubt, about the fact that what we have been doing with Bill C-244 was, in terms of 1970-71, attempting to take the \$60 million which the Treasury might otherwise have spent under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, to add \$40 million new money, and pay the total to the grain producers as \$100 million instead of \$60 million. As far as the rest of the program is concerned, it meant the assurance of a contribution by the Treasury of more money through the stabilization fund than would have been available to the farmer under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act in future years.

**Mr. Peters:** That is not true; you know it is not true.

**Mr. Lang:** It is certainly true.

**Mr. Peters:** It is not. The maximum would be \$40 million.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order please. The hon. minister has the floor.

**Mr. Lang:** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), who was so busy blocking things in committee, obviously never found out that there is no limit to the government's contribution.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Peters:** There is a limit, and you know that.

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, if exports could be brought up to the one billion bushel level, which I think we have to start taking as our target before long, and if sales can amount to the \$2 billion level, under the bill the government of Canada is committed to pay 4 per cent of 90 per cent of those marketings into the fund, however high that rises. In addition, if at any time the stabilization fund does not have enough money to bring the producers' income up to the previous five year average, under the bill the government of Canada is committed to lend to the fund, interest free, whatever amount of money is required to make that kind of payment. The Temporary