

Mr. ARGUE: I think this is an affront to the committee, that we should be spending our time looking into something that is working quite satisfactorily.

Mr. JORGENSEN: In the cases that were brought before the courts were they not to deal with an interpretation of the regulations as they existed at that time? Is it not an interpretation of the regulations?

Mr. MONK: The cases which were brought before the court were both on the same basis. They attacked, first of all, the constitutional validity of section 16 of the Canadian Wheat Board Act, and also attacked the application of the statute to feed mills. This regulation is not, by means of regulations made by the board; the regulation is effective as a result of section 16 of the statute. The matter before the courts is whether that section is valid; and if valid, whether it applies to feed mills.

Mr. BRUNSDEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be possible for the ones who are speaking to speak louder.

Mr. JORGENSEN: Assuming the courts have decided that the regulations, as they exist today, are valid, do you not believe that in view of the changing complex of agriculture—the accent on livestock production, that today it may be wise to just have a close look at it? That is why this committee was set up—to have another look to see if the act possibly may be in need of some revisions.

Mr. McNAMARA: I suggest that is a matter of decision by this committee but, in so far as the board is concerned, I would suggest that we welcome this opportunity in order that the pros and cons may be aired.

This problem—in fact, the whole administration of a quota system—is very difficult, and has given us many problems. We have to have public support. We cannot hope to do it unless we have the support of the producers. There is a problem involved here. We have tried to recognize it and go as far as we thought we could go to provide relief to the feed mills. However, we have no objections to these matters being aired, and we welcome the opportunity for an exchange of views, because evidence may be given in this committee that will assist you in making up your mind. The decisions of this committee will be referred to the government, and at that time we will have a good look at your recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN: The idea of the minister, in setting up this committee, was to get a consensus of opinion, through this committee.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question—and I think it is a fair question. If you have not the information, or do not want to disclose it, you can say so. My question is this: Who has been asking for this committee? I think we should have some of the names of the people who are trying to wreck the wheat board system of marketing grain—and that is what this is about. They should be prepared to put their case before us, and we should know who they are.

The CHAIRMAN: Different organizations will be appearing before this committee in the next two or three weeks. I will ask the secretary to read the names of those organizations.

Mr. ARGUE: I am referring to the organizations that want the regulations relaxed, and want the wheat board's control diminished or demolished.

The CHAIRMAN: The secretary will read those organizations.

The CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE: Today, we have the Canadian wheat board and the board of grain commissioners. On Friday, May 6, we will have the Alberta wheat pool. On Monday, May 9 we will have the local custom feed mills. On Friday, May 13, the interprovincial farm union of Saskatchewan. On Monday, May 16, we will have the Winnipeg chamber of commerce and the Canadian feed manufacturers association. On the following Monday, May 23,