

Canadian Livestock Feed Board

the power to make recommendations to the minister or to the board other than on matters referred to it by the minister or the board?

Mr. Sauv : There is no limitation as long as the matter deals with the responsibility of the feed grain board. Why should there be a limitation? Either you have a clause which says that an advisory committee is to be set up to do anything it wants or the clause states that it has to fulfil a minimum duty. This advisory committee has a minimum duty to fulfil but nothing would prevent it from doing more as long as what it does relates to Bill No. C-218.

Mr. Douglas: I am not going to labour this, Mr. Chairman, any further except to say to the minister that the committee has a certain limited duty. So far as the bill is concerned the committee has no power to do other than what the legislation entitles it to do, and all it is entitled to do at the present time is to study and review matters referred to it and to report on those matters to the minister or to the board. It has no other powers or terms of reference.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Chairman, on the same matter that has been brought to the attention of the minister, I understand the undertaking given by the minister that this is the minimum duty of the committee, and that is our understanding. However, that is not set out in the legislation before us. I wonder whether it would meet the wishes of the committee if the minister would accept an amendment to clause 15 (6) (a) in the following terms:

(a) to study and review all matters relating to feed grain transportation, storage, prices and consumption—

Then I insert the words:

—that it may deem necessary, together with those that are referred to it either by the Minister or by the Board;

This would remove the limitation in the proposed legislation and I believe it would grant this committee the powers under which the minister wishes it to administer its particular duties.

Mr. Sauv : Which subparagraph is this?

Mr. Danforth: It commences at line 26 on page 7. May I read how the clause will appear in the bill with the amendment:

(a) to study and review all matters relating to feed grain transportation, storage, prices and consumption that it may deem necessary, together with those that are referred to it either by the Minister or by the Board;

Mr. Sauv : This clarifies the intent and I have no objection to such amendment.

Mr. Langlois (M gantic): Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing the advisory committee for a little while and the minister has clearly indicated whom he would like to see on the advisory committee. I as well as some other members would like to state our intentions with regard to those we would not want to see on the committee; then we would know who should be on and who should not. It is not that people may not be qualified to do the job but that they may sometimes be in a peculiar situation.

A while ago some members made reference to the Wheat Board and the minister asked one of the members about the advisory committee to the Wheat Board. I should like to see a wheat board advisory committee, but it all depends on which committee he is talking about. Is he talking about the one to which the Wheat Board has to refer to find out about future prices or the one limited to studying the production side of grain in western Canada or in the producing areas? The latter one is doing a pretty good job. The other one is doing a very good job too, though not necessarily as it affects the Wheat Board.

The Wheat Board guarantees the price and purchase of wheat from the western farmers, but there is also a lot of responsibility on the grain exchanges. To belong to the grain exchange you must be a broker. All of the grain sold by the Wheat Board is bought by brokers, so we are going around in a vicious circle. I am not happy about this part of the picture and I am trying to prevent it in this case.

The members of the advisory committee might be those who were buying the grain or involved in the transportation or marketing of grain. The minister has clearly indicated that these people will not be members and I take his word in that regard. But who is going to be responsible for this following the minister? If I knew he would be minister forever I would sit down because I would trust the minister. But he will not be there forever. This is why I want the good will of the minister to be put on paper.

I wonder whether the minister would accept an amendment to clause 15 (6)(a) which would insert after the word "and" the words:

—no members of this committee shall be permitted to have direct financial or business interests in the matters which this committee will have to deal with.