

Canadian Livestock Feed Board

from an organization and to have someone selected who is a nominee of that organization.

I submit that farm organizations, such as the Farmers Union, the Federation of Agriculture, the Livestock Feeders Association and other groups, will feel much better if the person they have in mind as their spokesman is selected rather than have the minister simply reach into that organization, select an individual and put him on the committee. From the minister's own viewpoint it is better because the minister knows then he has a person who is going to assume some responsibility not only for expressing the views of that organization but for going back to that organization and explaining the program which the board is carrying out. From the minister's viewpoint, therefore, the personnel of this advisory committee become a two-way street, explaining to the minister and the board what the organizations want and explaining to the organizations what it is the minister and the board are trying to do. I hope the minister will give the committee some assurance that these people will be selected from a panel prepared by the farm organizations directly concerned.

Mr. Sauv : I agreed to this earlier and said we would ask a number of farm organizations to give us three names each. Then one of those would be appointed to the advisory committee. I think I said that in answer to one or two members.

Mr. Douglas: I was aware of that. If I may I should like to point out, however, that there are five or seven members to be appointed. I am not suggesting it is enough to allow a farm organization to submit three names and then select one who is going to be on a committee of five or seven. I should like to see the whole committee nominated by the various farm organizations.

Mr. Sauv : Yes, I agreed to this procedure.

Mr. Douglas: The second point which I think is giving the committee some concern relates to subclause 6 which sets out the duties of the advisory committee. They are restricted. The subclause reads in part as follows:

(a) to study and review all matters relating to feed grain transportation, storage, prices and consumption that are referred to it either by the minister or by the board; and

(b) to report to the minister and the board, with any recommendations that the committee considers desirable, the results of each study and review conducted by it.

[Mr. Douglas.]

I am not suggesting the minister is trying to restrict the advisory committee. I am sure what the minister has in mind is that this committee will be able from time to time to make recommendations to him or to the board. However, when you are dealing with legislation someone is going to come along and say, this is beyond the purview of this committee; it has no terms of reference that allow it to make such a recommendation. I know what the minister is up against when lawyers start to draft something. They are very careful how they draft legislation. I am not trying to draft the legislation, but perhaps the minister would be prepared to have paragraph (b) of subclause 6 read this way:

(b) to report to the minister and the board, with any recommendations that the committee considers desirable, the results of each study and review conducted by it and such other matters as it may deem expedient.

I think somewhere in its terms of reference the committee should have authority to make recommendations to the minister and the board outside of anything that has been referred to it. They do not have that power now. Some legalistic individual may raise this matter later and say to the committee: this is beyond your jurisdiction. The committee would be restricted to dealing only with such matters as were referred to it. I am sure that is not what the minister wishes if he wants a committee that is really going to keep him and the board properly informed as to the effectiveness of this legislation.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Sauv : In response to a question from the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough I said my interpretation of the clause was that this was the minimum they had to do. A distinction had to be made with regard to the powers and duties of the advisory committee, and it is the duty of the advisory committee to do this much at least. Perhaps the clause could have been drafted differently but my interpretation—and I give this undertaking to the house—is that the advisory committee will have much more responsibility than that required of it as a duty. That is the strict minimum required of the committee. It can inquire into other matters and conduct other studies for the board or the minister as it wishes.

Mr. Douglas: The minister said that subclause 6 is the minimum required, but where is the maximum? I am asking the minister where in clause 15 or anywhere else in the bill it says that the advisory committee has