

sure, be the province of Quebec. This is essentially because of the subsidy program.

The basic reason hogs were a casualty in the west was the unsatisfactory pricing system for domestic feed grains. That is why, when this great debate moves into Parliament, we have to address ourselves to it so completely. Surely the farmers themselves, both the producers of feed grains and their customers, cattle feeders and hog feeders, must make the decision themselves.

They are prepared to do that now after many, many years of discussion especially of the Crowsnest Pass freight rate and to a lesser degree the domestic feed grain pricing policy, both being hush-hush types of topics. They had never been raised seriously at annual meetings, but that situation has ended. These subjects are now out in the open. They are no longer taboo. We will see them raised here, and rightly so. However, when they are here, let us put on our non-partisan hats. Many members of Parliament will be involved. There are many farmers in western Canada who do not completely understand what is behind the Crowsnest Pass freight rate and what it does to the total agricultural economy and the total Canadian economy. There are many who do not understand, including farmers. That will be the case in this House, and when that situation arises, I will ask hon. members to be patient and to try to learn, understand and give the debate a chance to develop properly. I am sure it will eventually develop all across Canada. Hopefully at some time the committee will travel across Canada either to put a policy to livestock producers and grain growers or to ask their advice preliminary to a policy being established by the government.

**Mr. Benjamin:** We have done that a dozen times, Bert. Hon. members opposite do not have the guts to do anything. We have had a dozen hearings and heard a dozen submissions.

**Mr. Hargrave:** In response to my hon. friend, who at one time helped me ship cattle in Walsh, I will say that they will have an opportunity. The government of the day will have an opportunity to face up to this great question. In the meantime I say to hon. members very sincerely that this is not the time to abolish the open market for domestic feed grains.

**Mr. Louis R. Desmarais (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, in a review of the actual marketing circumstances for each of the major grains enumerated in motion No. 12 I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the different circumstances and conditions which affect the marketing of each grain. The only valid conclusion that can be drawn is that the board marketing system has already been adopted wherever it has appeared to be in the best interests of producers to do so.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has expired, and I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At 6 p.m. the House took recess.

### *Judges Act*

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### JUDGES ACT

#### MEASURE TO INCREASE SALARIES OF JUDGES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Chrétien that Bill C-34, an act to amend the Judges Act and certain other acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

● (2010)

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to say a few words about a very important bill before the House, that is, Bill C-34 to amend the Judges Act. Hon. members will know that the last time there was a serious debate about the Judges Act was in 1975. They will also know that this bill was introduced, received first reading on June 12, 1980, and that members of the judiciary have expressed considerable concern at the delays which it has encountered in receiving second reading.

As the hon. member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) pointed out it is, of course, the responsibility of the government to establish the legislative timetable, and certainly the delay in the tabling of this bill for second reading is one for which we bear no responsibility. We are as concerned as are members of the judiciary that this matter should receive serious study.

Under section 92(14) of the British North America Act, the provinces have jurisdiction over the administration of justice itself. We know that from time to time concerns have been expressed about the inadequacy of the resources which some provinces have allocated to the administration of justice at the provincial level—that they have not been prepared to give this important area the kind of priority that it deserves in Canadian society, with the result that the justice system, both criminal and civil, has suffered. We on this side of the House certainly hope that all provinces will take seriously their responsibility to provide adequate resources in the area of the administration of justice.

But Parliament itself has serious responsibilities toward the federal judiciary. Those responsibilities are established in the terms of the British North America Act, primarily in section 96 which deals with the appointment and supervision of judges, in certain sections which deal with the removal of judges, although fortunately their application has not been necessary in Canada, and in section 100 which sets the terms of compensation and pensions for the federal judiciary. These are serious responsibilities which no member of the House takes lightly. Similarly, it is very important there be no suggestion that these responsibilities under the British North America Act should in some way be foisted off on some special advisory board or on the governor in council without there