

The movement of rapeseed, which is an off-board grain, also caused a number of problems. In *The Western Producer*, for September 18, 1980, we find the following comment:

Unpriced rapeseed has been a serious problem for the Alberta Wheat Pool, according to Ted Ball, director of operations. Ball says during the middle of August, AWP's Pacific Terminal was so full of unpriced rapeseed administered by grain dealers that the Pool was having trouble taking delivery of enough of its own rapeseed to fill its sales program.

The Pool was forced to obtain rapeseed from other grain companies to fill commitments—

That same rapeseed also caused a lot of trouble in the futures market because the futures market did not work. The cash price for rapeseed is considerably lower than the futures price. However, I will not go into that aspect today.

Because the Wheat Board is forced to sell barley to fulfil eastern feed orders at a corn competitive price, we are concerned the price of barley may become so high that it will be profitable for Ontario traders to buy barley from the west and resell it at an export price. Again there has been considerable loss because of that factor.

I started my comments with a global look at food needs and our responsibility in fulfilling those needs. The type of orderly market suggested for grain by this motion would allow the farmers of Canada to fulfil those needs efficiently, as far as grain is concerned, without themselves or consumers being exploited by speculators or by multinational corporations.

This motion touches only the grain area. We need the same kind of orderly market in all farm commodity areas. This government has expressed support for that movement. Indeed, it has established effective and successful marketing boards in many areas. Let us hope the government will help to extend that direction by passing this motion and getting on with the job in other areas as well.

Mr. Peter Lang (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael) is most concerned about this issue raised by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) and he asked me to outline some thoughts on this motion. The hon. member for St. Boniface wanted to be here, but his responsibilities on the constitutional committee have prevented him from doing so.

It is likely that the reason we have both the board and open market systems operating side by side in Canada today is because of the advantages either system offers in particular marketing situations.

When it is suggested that all the major grains in Canada should be placed under a single marketing board and under the delivery quota system, I think we should take a careful look at the marketing system for each grain in deciding whether it could be better handled by a marketing board or whether it would fare better on the open market. In each case we need to examine the applicable federal and provincial legislation. More important, we need to ascertain the views of producers of each grain on whether they wish to have the sale of their crop transferred from one marketing system to another.

Canadian Wheat Board

I recognize in this motion a fine tribute to the objectives of the particular farm organizations which have been advocating the universal adoption of the board marketing system, to the exclusion of the open market, for the past 60 years. It is also a tribute to the operating performance of the Canadian Wheat Board since 1935. Yet, there are many who believe that the well-intended pursuit of that objective to the complete destruction of the open market could lead to unexpected and unwelcome results, which may be unacceptable to the affected producers themselves.

For example, problems could arise in placing crops such as corn and soybeans under the jurisdiction of a conglomerate grain marketing board whose constitutional authority for marketing grain is limited to interprovincial and export trade which may not apply to corn and soybeans at all.

Having made the point that different circumstances surround the marketing of each grain, which the mover of this motion would like to assign to a single marketing board, I shall now review the experience the Canadian Wheat Board has had with the marketing of oats and barley since 1949 and the practical lessons learned when you try to handle different crops having distinctly different market outlets within the supervision of one board.

The federal government has had very serious misgivings concerning problems which would face the Canadian Wheat Board if it were the sole marketing agency for western oats and barley, as western producers and eastern feeders evidently wanted. The doubts over its practicability were well expressed by the Hon. C. D. Howe, who introduced an amendment to the Canadian Wheat Board Act on February 27, 1948, to provide for the board marketing of oats and barley.

● (1730)

Because his statement so clearly contrasted the market situations for wheat and the major coarse grains, and underscored the need for complementary provincial legislation, all of which is relevant to the motion we now have before us, I would like to place part of Mr. Howe's statement on the record again, and I quote from pages 1677-78 of the House of Commons Debates in 1948:

The fourth amendment proposes to empower the governor in council by regulation to extend to oats and barley the regulations now applicable to wheat. Strong representations favouring the marketing of oats and barley through the Wheat Board have been received from farm organizations in this regard, provided a workable plan can be agreed upon. However, the government is well aware that the compulsory marketing of oats and barley through the board represents serious difficulties. The success of such an enterprise must be dependent on a large measure of agreement on policy matters as between organized farmers of both the producer and the consumer class, as well as on the co-operation of provincial governments. Therefore, this government will wish to have concrete evidence of such agreement and such co-operation before it can assume the responsibility for putting this amendment into effect.

He goes on to illustrate some of the difficulties he sees, such as the fact that oats and barley are primarily feed crops, most of which do not even leave the farm. He concluded:

The government is prepared to take whatever steps lie within its power to assist in establishing marketing arrangements that will help to maintain economic and stable prices for Canadian agricultural products. The government must,