

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DETERMINATION OF PAYMENT FOR WHEAT—EXTENSION OF APPLICATION TO FLAX-SEED, RYE AND RAPESEED

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lang that Bill C-238, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

● (8:10 p.m.)

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, when the debate was adjourned at five o'clock I was indicating that I was not happy to have rapeseed, in particular, included within the provisions of this bill under which certain grains will come under the authority of the Canadian Wheat Board. I do not understand how the minister could say that he had no intention of making the relevant clause of the bill operative unless certain conditions are met.

He tells us that there will be a plebiscite or a registration of intention in one form or another. He did not tell us what method he would select. However, the fact that Parliament will have passed the bill will give the government the right at any time, even in the dead of night as was the case with the War Measures Act, to implement its provisions without prior explanation. We shall merely see a press release the next day saying, "On the basis of our information, we had to do it this way." The government might claim that it had to act that way because of possible fluctuations in the stock market.

In any event, the producers will have no say in the implementation of these provisions. It is all very well for the minister to assure us that they will not be implemented unless certain conditions are met. I point out that he may not occupy his position one year from now, six months from now or even two days from now; perhaps the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) will shift him to another position. So his assurances in that regard really are not very weighty.

I cannot understand the minister. The committee headed by Mr. Boden that was studying this question suggested that rapeseed should not at this time come under the authority of the Canadian Wheat Board, yet the minister went against that recommendation. The Rapeseed Growers' Association does not want rapeseed to come under the authority of the Wheat Board operations. An article which appeared recently in the *Regina Leader-Post* reads in part:

Rapeseed producers' organizations in the prairie provinces will fight to have rapeseed excluded from the marketing jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, Ken Naber, president of the Saskatchewan Rapeseed Growers' Association, said Monday.

Mr. Naber said the groups have requested a hearing before the Commons committee on agriculture to plead their case.

Canadian Wheat Board Act

I know that Mr. Forrest Hetland, former head of the Rapeseed Growers' Association, felt that rapeseed should not be included under the Wheat Board's authority and that the present marketing system was satisfactory. If the rapeseed producers do not want rapeseed to come under the authority of the Wheat Board, surely we should not do it merely because the NDP want us to. I do not accept the NDP challenge and I throw it back in their teeth. They want this to be done merely because of something some of their members said 20 years ago. That is no reason for dragging rapeseed growers into this bill. They should not be manipulated by a group of people who do not understand rapeseed growers' interests. Surely the producers know what is best for them. I can visualize headlines in western newspapers pointing out what some Members of Parliament are advocating.

We know what has happened with our wheat sales; we know how much wheat has been sold. It has been piled up all over the Prairies. We know what has happened to our barley and oats. We have almost gone out of production in some cases. We grow just enough to satisfy our own requirements. Some farmers do not grow enough to fill a bowl of porridge. Why must the rapeseed growers be dragged into this situation? For years the industry fought toward its goal and it is now reaping the reward—but not in this bill.

I want to pay tribute to a former member of this House, a colleague of mine. He is now a constituent of the minister's. Reynold Rapp fought long and hard on behalf of the rapeseed people. He was instrumental in having rapeseed included in the definition of "grain", thus making it possible for it to be carried under the Crownsnest Pass arrangements. The work he did encouraged the production of this grain. Why drag it in now and put it under the authority of the Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker? As has been indicated, pooling arrangements and the quota system mean that there is an averaging in this regard. What will we gain by including rapeseed? Salesmen have enough trouble selling wheat. How on earth will they sell rapeseed? Will they switch from wheat to rapeseed? Will the board employ new men?

Let me point out that the rapeseed growers know their business and have contacts in the markets. In a newspaper clipping, which I do not have before me, Charles Gibbings said that putting all these commodities into one group, to be administered by the Wheat Board and having them serviced by one salesman, just will not work in future. The people who sell rapeseed must be interested in selling. Of course, if an unconscionable amount of profit were being made, perhaps there would be room for concern. But that is not the case. We have been successful in selling that commodity. The minister knows that the industry is trying to empty the elevators. That, as he said, is to our advantage.

There is another reason why I do not want rapeseed included within the ambit of the Wheat Board's authority. We do not know what will be the effect of the government's grain receipts stabilization policy, and if this bill is passed in its present form it will mean that the minister could implement certain of its provisions within six months, say, and include rapeseed under the