

## Feed Grains

will tell this House what he proposes to do. He has said in this House that he is going to take the matter to the western economic opportunities conference, but we look in vain for anything about it in the position papers. As a matter of fact there is very little of any consequence about agriculture in those position papers.

Government ministers go out to British Columbia and say what they are going to do for the westerners. Well, they are going to take more away than they are going to contribute, Mr. Speaker, and this government has been doing that for a long, long time.

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

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) hoping to hear something that he might believe in and recommend, but I failed to hear any such thing. I was hesitant about rising to speak in this debate because I thought the hon. member for Saskatoon-Humboldt (Mr. Lang) would have eagerly sought this opportunity to explain the apprehension he has caused throughout the Prairies at a number of meetings he has had with farm leaders and by statements that he has made. I would have thought that he would welcome the earliest opportunity to set aside those fears, and particularly to set aside any outcropping of alienation in western Canada that might still be evident after the Liberals meeting this last weekend in Vancouver. Some one suggests it was a wake. It may well have been. As I flew to Ottawa early this morning, I searched the papers to ascertain what solutions were arrived at in Vancouver at the conference hoping I might be enlightened about what the minister believed and what he might have said about feed grains policy.

**Mr. Lang:** Was there anything in the *Crowfoot Eagle*?

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** There was nothing in the *Crowfoot Eagle* or the *Calgary Herald* or the *Toronto Star* or the *Globe and Mail* that was complimentary to any position the Liberal party might have taken in Vancouver. There was absolutely no mention in any other papers of any position they might have taken on the feed grains issue.

One does not have to be blind or deaf to realize that western Canada is greatly concerned about this problem. I have in my hand copies of at least 40 telegrams received by various members, and maybe by all western members, about the question of a feed grains policy for Canada which the minister has allowed to seep out in a certain amount of his thinking. He has not informed the country of his thinking and he has not told the country what he told the farm leaders which provoked the large avalanche of telegrams from western groups. He has not told parliament what that thinking was.

I hesitated to speak at this time because I thought the minister would be eager to clear the air, to set aside and not build up the alienation that he may have caused. But one only has to begin reading the telegrams to realize that the minister has caused a great deal of alienation. One, from the National Farmers' Union District No. 2 demands that the power of the Wheat Board not be lessened and in fact that control be extended to all grains.

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

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** That is just one telegram on the top of a pile that expressed the thought that the minister may well be building up a great deal of alienation. Yet the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) tries to convince people in western Canada that he is concerned and worried about this build-up of alienation. If he is really worried, Mr. Speaker, the best thing he can do is take the Wheat Board out of the control of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang).

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

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** I do not believe that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) is too knowledgeable about western Canada's problems, but I think he has conveyed to the people of Canada a deep-rooted feeling of concern for farmers generally. I should like to recommend, as one solution toward lessening the alienation in western Canada, one that the Prime Minister could readily accept and adopt, that the Minister of Justice, who, as I say, has aroused this alienation and provoked the concern of many, many people all across western Canada, relinquish control of the Wheat Board. Certainly his continuance as minister in charge of the Wheat Board will do nothing to set aside that alienation.

Dealing with the particular motion put forward by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, Mr. Speaker, he seems to cover the waterfront and in doing so pours no oil on the troubled waters. The motion is really in two parts. The first part reads:

... for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the threat to Canadian agriculture created by the United States action in licensing and controlling the export of oilseed products ...

Then as an "if and after"—a catchall clause—he adds this:

... to outline to Parliament the government's proposals for its new policy on the sale and pricing of domestic feed grains.

He adds that as a kind of afterthought, a kind of catchall clause dealing with the whole problem of feed grains policy in western Canada. He dealt basically with the problem of feed grains but there is one particular point that I think has been missed in this question of trying to understand the licensing and controlling of export of oilseed products.

● (2030)

Before you solve a problem, you must understand its cause. The United States, finding meat prices rising higher and higher, tried to curtail these ever-rising prices by limiting the export of soybean meal. Canada reacted by limiting the export of soybean meal. We did this with permits and licenses. In addition, we reacted by licensing and controlling the export of rapeseed meal. The products are similar, but one cannot take the place of the other. Perhaps 10 per cent of our soybean meal can be supplanted by rapeseed meal. That fact is not commonly known. I spoke to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie) and apparently his officials made him aware of that. He said that we must react; actually he admitted that we were reacting. I ask, what is the purpose of reacting? Apparently he and his officials felt that we ought to react.