

clock back a little. In the past we took the power of decision-making away from the owner of the product and gave that power to a board of experts. We could allow the owner of the product some little say in the decision-making process; therefore, I support any decision for making the advisory board an elected one. The recommendation of the hon. member for Moose Jaw, namely, that members of the proposed advisory group should be elected from producers, is sound.

Let me make one thing clear. The minister in charge of the Wheat Board said in committee that the proposed amendment is good; but something strange happened on the way to the forum, so to speak. All the Liberal members on the committee who knew nothing about wheat and nothing about western Canada decided to vote against the amendment; that is why the matter has been raised in the House today. We are attempting to correct the injustice which occurred in that committee. Surely all members know that the Wheat Board would like to get advice from producers, that the bulk of farmers want some say in the decision-making process and that the Palliser group, which has been in the news for the last few years, is in favour of this move. Further, I suggest that people who love their country, who want to see the owners of a product maintain some sort of control over that product, would also support the amendment. Really, this amendment says to farmers, "You have the right to have producers on the advisory board."

As several others have mentioned in the debate, this country is run by the bureaucracy. Really, the cabinet has little power; it listens to its advisers. Our population is dissatisfied with this and expresses dissatisfaction in many ways. In the dairy industry, wheat industry and poultry industry, to name but some segments of our economy, experts are trying to run the whole show and give no say to the producer. This is happening at both the federal and provincial levels in Canada. If we continue on this road by 1990, 90 per cent of the people of this country will be working for some government institution. That is the course we have charted ourselves. I appeal to the House to support this simple amendment. Without doubt, the professional politician or bureaucrat who runs our big organizations must move over and give the producer or owner some chance to have a say in matters which affect him. That is what the amendment says.

I shall close with a well considered example. The world is hungry and needs food. In our dry farm lands of the west, by using our knowledge and expertise which has resulted in new types of grain in the last 20 years, we can produce more grain. Does this House and country know that our experts in the Canadian Wheat Board and experts in the farm corporations have opposed bringing of these new types of grain into the marketing system of our country? At least a dozen new varieties have passed every scientific test there is, yet are suppressed from farm use.

● (1200)

There are new types of grain which produce many more bushels per acre, at the same cost. They would feed many more million people. However, the experts say they cannot accept these new grains because there would be trouble in the grading system. One particular grain, has 3 per cent or 4 per cent of small kernels. Even though this grain would

Canadian Wheat Board Act (No. 2)

produce 30 or 40 more bushels per acre, it is turned down because the experts say it would be hard to market, with 3 per cent or 4 per cent of small kernels. I am not the one to judge that. However, with a hungry world on one side, and farmers who want more income on the other, I think the farmers should have this brought to their attention so they can study it with the producers with regard to any problems of growing. The farmers should decide on the types of grain we have to sell.

I know that the Canadian Wheat Board are well intentioned. They have an efficient-running system with the present grades. They do not want to change that efficient system. It is the very nature of bureaucracy that once you get it running, you do not change it. The farm organizations which make money out of storage do not want it changed. It would mean having new grades to handle in their elevators. The vested interests who own the elevators, and the people who are bureaucrats by profession, oppose this type of question being brought to public attention. This matter has been before those of us who have been responsible for decisions for the past 20 years. It has not come to public debate because no one who advises the Wheat Board or sits on the Wheat Board wants to bring it to public debate. I believe there are eight or ten producers on that advisory board who would be able to enter a public debate on this issue, and they who have the right to decide would make the decision.

This question has moral issues as well as economic ones. The curse of this and other countries today is that we have turned the responsibility of governing the nation at the national, provincial and corporate levels over to experts. I was not surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin). He knows, as well as I do, that in the management of our companies and unions we have turned over their running to the experts. Experts keep the fight going as long as they can between labour and management, because that is the only way they can get paid.

Mr. Benjamin: Let the farmer decide.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): That is right: let the farmer also decide whether he wants bureaucrats to represent him, or his own people. I simply say that if you put a weasel in a hen-house, the weasel represents the weasel.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): If you put in a man that represents a corporation which makes its money out of storage, all he will think about is storage.

Mr. Benjamin: What if the hens elect the weasel?

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): If the hens elect the weasel, you know what will happen to the hens. I think I have made my point. Let me give one little warning to the government side. The farmers know the significance of this amendment. By the eastern members on that committee voting down what the minister recommended was a good idea, they have put the Liberal members in the farm areas in jeopardy because farmers have had it up to the neck with regard to being run by bureau-