

*Canadian Livestock Feed Board*

Board. When it does, it goes on the marketplace as a broker. There is no source of difficulty with respect to the matter the hon. member raised because it is the Wheat Board which will decide whether they wish to give up their power, or not, or whether they will allow imports to come in or not. The agency will not be buying and selling.

**Mr. Schreyer:** I rise to support paragraph (d). We have heard suggestions that the Wheat Board should divest itself of its power to control the international movement of grain. If this were to happen I believe it would be most unfortunate. In my opinion anything which would fragmentize the control exercised by the board over this kind of grain movement would be unfortunate. I do not know who is asking for it—whether there is any pressure on the government, or on the Wheat Board to divest itself of this power; but I for one certainly hope it will not happen.

**Mr. Olson:** I wish to raise one question concerning subclause (c) which reads—

Allocate space reserved for its use in any storage facility among persons requiring feed grain storage facilities in Eastern Canada.

At present, of course, it is the Board of Grain Commissioners who have full authority to allocate space in all the terminal elevators, at least those along the seaway, and perhaps in other elevators or storage places in eastern Canada. I am wondering if this allocation of space will be an authority directly invested in this board over some of that same storage, or whether there will be an allocation of space in so far as the kind of grain and where it came from are concerned, after the Board of Grain Commissioners have designated the space for the export of wheat and for other grains. Will they have the authority directly to order designation of space in some of these terminal elevators?

• (4:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Sauv :** Once the Board of Grain Commissioners have determined in a certain year that so much space should be reserved for feed grain for local consumption, then inside this our board could allocate space for various needs, taking into account pressures, prices and so on.

**Mr. Nowlan:** My question follows the one asked by the hon. member for Queens earlier, who inquired about an incentive or stimulant for local production so that there may be no discrimination under this bill against people

who produce their own feed grain. Clause 6 says that payments by the board will only be made for storage and transportation. Is there any clause in the bill to help stimulate the growth of feed grains in eastern Canada and British Columbia? If more feed grains could be produced by the provision of drainage and fertilizer, then the problem which this bill is supposed to meet would be solved.

This business of continuing subsidies can be a drain, can have a negative effect. Over a period of three years, depending on the size of the unit, a producer could pay for his own draining and drying equipment. I cite the case of a grain drying unit costing \$16,000 which could handle 1,600 tons of grain. That grain is subsidized at approximately \$12 a ton, and the subsidy on 500 tons would cost the government \$6,000 a year. Thus over a period of three years, out of the subsidy the farmer could pay outright for his draining and drying facilities and thus need not be a charge to the Canadian taxpayers forever and a day.

**Mr. Sauv :** In answer to similar questions, I have already explained that the problem of the production of corn and grain in Ontario and the maritime provinces was under consideration. There is provision in clause 6(a) (i) and (ii) to assist with this.

**Mr. Nowlan:** The only reason I ask is that it specifically sets out payments for storage and transportation, and adds "in accordance with the regulations." Why could we not set this out specifically in a subclause?

**Mr. Sauv :** It is because of the origin of the subsidy. It was originally a transportation subsidy, so that the amount of money parliament grants for it has to be related to transportation now. There are methods that can be used to relate transportation costs to locally produced grain and corn, but the principle has to be the transportation costs.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Transportation could be from your feed grain plot to your drying and cleaning mill, right on your own farm.

**Mr. Sauv :** I have answered some previous questions about this. Studies are now being conducted into the matter. I am as occupied as is the hon. member with the problem of the local producers of corn and grain, and we are about to come to grips with it.

**Mr. Danforth:** The minister has been patient with me, but I hope he will bear further