

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

To bring my remarks to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) that there is provision in the bill for only \$100,000 for each commodity agency that would be set up, or \$1 million in total. That means that there could be ten different commodity agencies established. It has been very clearly stated, at least in the remarks I have made before the committee and before the House, that this is for the purpose of establishing the marketing agencies and from there on their activities will be financed by their own operations. If Parliament and the government decide or suggest further subsidies, that would be another decision separate and distinct from the decision we would be making in passing this bill. He called for a flexible attitude with reference to the members of the agencies. Certainly, producers and other groups will be consulted with respect to nominations to the agencies. I agree with him that flexibility is needed, at least in the initial stages of setting up a marketing agency, so that we can, without legal impediment, seek out and appoint to these boards people with the competence to do a good job on behalf of the industry all the way from the producers through retailing and to the consumer as well.

● (3:30 p.m.)

I was pleased to hear him speak of the need for consultation and also the need for the promotion of markets and that sort of thing. This is provided for in some of the clauses of this bill. It is my hope that such will be a major function of some of the agencies that are set up—in fact a far superior function to that of imposing some of the mandatory quotas that are objectionable to some producers. I hope that we can now send this bill to the committee and deal with the amendments that I suggested which were considered very favourably in committee.

In conclusion I wonder, inasmuch as there was support from the other members who have spoken, whether I could ask to have the evidence taken in the last session with respect to Bill C-197 before the Standing Committee on Agriculture, taken under advisement or reinstated for the purpose of considering Bill C-176.

Mr. Baldwin: We would be quite agreeable to that, Mr. Speaker. I can see no good reason why all the time and money thrown away in connection with proceedings in the committee should be repeated. However, I think the order should be made without prejudice to the rights of members of the committee to pursue any examination of witnesses or briefs that were presented. This might not be necessary, but in an attempt to facilitate the passage of that bill in order that it could be brought back in the dying days of the last session, we did hurry through some of our examinations. If the order is without prejudice, we are perfectly willing that this should be done.

Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding that these are the terms of the order proposed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The order would be to the effect that the evidence already presented to the committee would be reinstated, without prejudice to the right of the commit-

[Mr. Olson.]

tee to call further witnesses either with respect to new matters or matters already covered by the evidence which will then be before the committee as a result of this order. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

* * *

CANADA GRAIN BILL

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION, PROVISIONS RESPECTING GRADING, LICENCES, ELEVATORS, ETC.

On the Order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Agriculture of Bill C-175, an Act respecting grain—The Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I first give notice that I am going to raise a point of order with respect to this bill being proceeded with at this time because of certain technical objections. However, before doing so, and on a general point of order, I think I should be entitled to say on behalf of members of our party—and I say this without in any way disparaging the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) who is discharging his obligations as Government House Leader most effectively—that it was indicated last night we would be proceeding with another bill. For reasons which are quite obvious, that bill was not circulated so that hon. members could not proceed with it at this time.

We have indicated our willingness to proceed with this bill, but because of the change in plan some of our members who are interested in this subject are not here today. I am not blaming the President of the Privy Council; he is just unfortunate in his choice of colleagues. However, if we are to discharge our responsibilities in processing the business of the house and the government, then the government will have to learn to bring in at an earlier stage in any session all the bills it should have ready, so that when second reading is called we will have had an opportunity to evaluate the legislation and to decide upon our position. After all, the period of gestation has been quite lengthy and the government have had ample time to draft the bill. There really is no valid excuse for this state of affairs today.

Having said that, we are ready to proceed, but I thought I should make that statement. I repeat, I am not putting any blame upon the minister. Indeed, I shall probably have other opportunities during the session to blame him more effectively for matters for which he is responsible. I hope that he will persuade his colleagues to bring in bills well before the date when this House proposes to deal with them so that we can make arrangements to proceed.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture) moved that Bill C-175 respecting grain, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.