

clause 7 that rye, flaxseed and rapeseed may be brought under the cash advance legislation but will only be brought under it when they are included in the provisions of the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

By his amendment which trying to undo the committee's work the minister is endeavouring to allow the elevator companies, or the Wheat Board, to claim money from deliveries of rye, flaxseed and rapeseed on a cash advance taken from oats, wheat and barley. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister, is this really what he is trying to do? If it is, he should at least acknowledge the fact. He never acknowledged it in the committee; in fact, he went out of his way to assure the committee that the opposite was correct. If the opposite is true, then the amendment moved by the hon. member for Mackenzie in the committee is correct in every way. This is what that hon. member said in the committee, as recorded at page 40 of committee proceedings No. 53:

All right, if this is the point of friction, then perhaps we can leave in "to the board". But "of any kind" simply implies that I have to commit all grain that I sell to the board when in fact I may have taken an advance on one or two specific grains.

The hon. member for Mackenzie is directly on the point. He is saying that if we leave in "of any kind" we are including all grains, but all grains are not available for a cash advance; under this act the cash advance is concerned only with wheat, oats and barley.

**An hon. Member:** Keep on reading.

**Mr. Horner:** Somebody suggests that I keep on reading. I suggest that he get up and make his own speech. He will have ample time, but my time is limited. The hon. member for Mackenzie is pointing out that under the legislation cash advances are available with respect to wheat, oats and barley and not with respect to other grains, but the inclusion of the words "of any kind" means that repayment might be claimed on other grains with respect to advances taken on those three grains.

Through this amendment the minister seeks to replace the original words in the bill and undo all the good work of the committee. I emphasize that the committee called experts before it. One of the strong arguments for sending bills to committee is that in committee experts can be called and examined and the examination of experts can guide the committee to the correct interpretation of legislation and to correct amendments to move. But here the minister is saying that the experts are wrong, that the hon. member for Mackenzie is wrong, and he wants the bill returned to its original wording.

If that is the case, the minister has to answer this crucial question: Will sales of rye, rapeseed and flaxseed be used to repay cash advances made on wheat, oats and barley? If the minister replies, "no, under no circumstances," that is fine and the correct interpretation of "of any kind" is immediately understood.

In the committee discussion the hon. member for Mackenzie went on the state clearly that he had no objection to wheat, oats and barley being used to repay a cash advance that had been made, but that he did worry about some of the other all-inclusive clauses of the bill. I

### *Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act*

think these questions must be answered before we blindly do away with all the good work of the committee.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Mackenzie was passed in the committee by a vote of 13 to 9. It is a well known fact, Mr. Speaker, that the government has 17 supporters on the agricultural committee. That vote was taken on Thursday, May 27, a day when the House did not sit. Hon. members were not occupied in this chamber; they were supposed to be dutifully occupied in committees which were sitting, so there was no real excuse for government supporters being short-handed in the agricultural committee. I can only conclude that after close examination of the witnesses who were before the committee at that time the majority of the committee members wished clause 4(2) to be amended. Members of the committee did not vote on party lines on this particular issue; they voted according to common sense.

• (8:20 p.m.)

When the minister rose to introduce his amendment he was allowed 40 minutes in which to speak, according to the rules of the House. He spoke for about seven minutes and gave no real reason for undoing the good work of the committee. If that is the way committees are to be treated, if they are merely to occupy the time of hon. members, if the work of committees is held in such low regard, and if the government thinks committees do no good perhaps it would be better if we reverted to the old system and considered bills in committee of the whole. Then at least deputy ministers and those involved with different aspects of the department would come to the House, hon. members could direct questions to the government and elicit answers and bills would not pass until satisfactory answers were given. Silence in many respects may be golden, but in dealing with legislation silence on the part of the government is not.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Horner:** I hear the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) interjecting. The hon. member and the minister in charge of the Wheat Board have remained silent while I have been making my point. The minister has failed in any way to defend his reversal of the committee's work. The committee worked for long hours—

**An hon. Member:** Be careful now.

**Mr. Horner:** —in hearing the testimony of experts who appeared before it.

**Mr. Boulanger:** I hope the hon. member is not being carried away.

**Mr. Horner:** If that is the way the work of the committees is to be treated, let me make this point. I notice the House leader is in the chamber. This happened on May 27, when the House was not sitting in order to allow committees to do their work. Hon. members dutifully attended committees instead of attending this House. The vote on the amendment in committee was 13 to 9. There