

organizations all doing research and all going in different directions. I have here a bulletin from the National Farmers Union which reports that the council has voted to seat four new members, two from the grain trade, one from the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, a local government body, and one representing the Carman Business Group, a small group of farmers from Manitoba.

If the Grains Council can include representation from such a broad spectrum of those interested in the production of grain, why should the minister object to the amendment which has been put forward? I cannot understand why he should denounce the amendment so strongly. I have no way of knowing, of course, whether the people and the groups referred to in this bulletin have actually been admitted to the Grains Council; it is my understanding that the federal minister must ratify the action of the council in this regard. Whether he has done so in this case, I do not know. I could be wrong in my assumption that the minister has anything to do with the ratification of the acts of the council, but I should be surprised if he did not have his finger in the pie somewhere.

From a news publication put out by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool on May 4, I understand that a new international association of wheat producers has been proposed. We are told:

If a new association is formed it will attempt to stabilize wheat prices, suggest production control programs and arrange for long-term fixed price sales contracts, in an effort to stabilize world wheat markets.

Whether or not this is the proposal we have before us as far as the Palliser Wheat Growers Association is concerned, I do not know. But how many organizations and associations do we need to cover the same ground? Again, I say I am in favour of national marketing control if we can come up with an association which really represents all the people engaged in the production of the goods concerned. It is inconsistent with any of our principles in this country that those most directly involved should not be provided for in the legislation affecting them. I trust the minister will at some point explain to the House whether he is concerned about marketing boards or about some other aspect of this issue concerning which we must draw our own conclusions.

We know what is going on in the world as far as international brokerage firms are concerned. We know they are handling grain for

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

the Wheat Board. We know the government has not provided the board with any tools to enable it to do its job while at the same time allowing the international brokerage firms to be the marketing agency for grain. I wonder whether these firms will also be placed in a position to act as our marketing agency in connection with the products mentioned in the bill before us. The minister might comment on this aspect of the matter.

The minister made what seemed to me to be a pathetic attempt to explain why Canada did not maintain permanent marketing missions abroad. If we eventually set up a marketing board, I wonder whether the minister will realize that we do in fact need a complete marketing system and that this involves foreign missions to handle the marketing of our crops, apart from wheat. To engage successfully in world markets we must benefit by the services of foreign missions as opposed to the hodge-podge of associations which exist at the present time.

As we read some of the articles which have been written on the subject of this bill, most of us will be inclined to give credit to those who wrote them and did the necessary research to bring to light some of the facts in this connection. This is the purpose of the press—to truthfully report these items in order that the people can evaluate plans and proposals which are presented to them.

• (9:00 p.m.)

The heading of an article in the *Globe and Mail* of March 18 last is: "Olson seeks wide cabinet powers in marketing of farm products." I am sure that many people across the country are beginning to wonder whether the wide marketing powers of the cabinet are in the best interests of those in the agricultural production business. The article goes on to say:

The legislation will give the cabinet the power to create national farm products marketing agencies for individual commodities. These agencies could have a wide range of responsibilities, ranging from selling and pricing to packing, transportation and storage.

It also provides for the creation of a national farm products marketing council that would supervise and review the operation of marketing agencies and plans established under the proposed act.

I can see nothing wrong with that, and if that is all that is meant I am sure we would all agree with that philosophy. However, the article goes on:

The legislation provides for the appointment of inspectors who will have broad powers to search for regulated commodities and examine books and