

*Canagrex*

agency in the other country. To me, that makes perfect sense. I find it very difficult to understand the objections of Members of the Official Opposition. I do not say this in any partisan or political sense. I am being very sincere in my attempt to understand the objections to the Bill made by Members of the Official Opposition.

There have been instances where valid concerns have been expressed and, from my perspective, those concerns have been addressed by limiting the powers of Canagrex to act when requested to do so and on a state-to-state basis. We in the House have been led to believe that, all of a sudden, Crown corporations are taboo. We have been led to believe that a Crown corporation is something that we should not entertain, something that should not be created. Yet where have successes taken place with in much of the agricultural sector? They have taken place in areas where Crown corporations exist. In the Province of Prince Edward Island, there would be severe problems in the dairy industry if it were not for the Canadian Dairy Corporation. In the hog area we have a hog board and it is a stable area. What do we have in beef, anything? No, we have problems. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, from my perspective, I fail to understand why, in the manufacturing area, we can have a Crown corporation which has worked extremely successfully in identifying opportunities for our Canadian manufacturers, and yet in our own area of agriculture, where such a great potential exists, we are prepared to say we should not do that. The private sector in many areas of agriculture is doing extremely well and we encourage it to continue on. However, let us not destroy the mechanism which can enable that particular sector of our Canadian economy, which has such great potential, to realize that potential and to realize it in a very real way.

● (1650)

**Mr. Thacker:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe there is some time left in the Hon. Member's ten minutes. I wonder if he would accept a question?

**Mr. Campbell (Cardigan):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Thacker:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the Hon. Minister would say to the evidence that the committee had that Industry, Trade and Commerce was providing some pretty good service in the area of assisting agriculture? It has the PEMD project which provides for specific project bidding, market identification, participation in trade fairs, incoming foreign buyers, export consortia. In short, we have a whole bureaucracy in the Government right now. As well, we have financing provisions and others in the Export Development Corporation which could help these people. Why do we need a whole new corporation with all these enormous powers, duplication and expense?

**Mr. Campbell (Cardigan):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer to that question is a very simple one. The Export Development Corporation and Industry, Trade and Commerce have a very clear mandate to assist the manufacturer in our country to realize his full potential. However, I fail to see why we are against setting up a parallel operation which can help one of the areas where we probably have the greatest potential,

and that is in agriculture. One of the difficulties, as I understand, in the export development area, and in the mandate of Industry, Trade and Commerce, is that one of the areas which has been excluded is the area of agricultural products. Therefore, we have been having problems in that area in a very real way. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that if Industry, Trade and Commerce can complement the thrust of this particular Bill, so much the better. Let us have an organization, however, which can direct its full attention, its full focus and its full effort to take full advantage of what I said right at the very beginning, the \$2 billion opportunity which exists for agriculture in our country today.

**Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Campbell). However, I believe that in making his case he has downgraded or neglected—perhaps “neglected” would be the better word—the services which are already provided by the trade commissioners service which is composed of members of the foreign service who are posted abroad to promote and help market Canadian products. That has been their mandate and they have earned the respect of Canadian producers throughout the world. I have, upon occasion, acted in the absence of a foreign trade commissioner in my office, by performing in that capacity and receiving a load of cattle in Central America at a time when there was a group of Ontario cattle producers who had the initiative to carry forward and get their cattle into the Central American market. I went down there to help them. They did all the groundwork themselves. There was a bit of prestige involved, I suppose, by the Ambassador going out to help them off-load the cattle and get them to market. That is promotion, if you like, but that sort of operation should not be downgraded. That part of the work is being done in the agricultural field as well as in other fields.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today in taking part in this debate because it is not often that one has his comments cut off short at six o'clock by the clock on one day in one particular debate and is able to carry them on the following day in another debate. That is exactly what has happened to me today. I had about four minutes last evening, Mr. Speaker, in which to speak about the problems of responsibility of Crown corporations and the dangers which lie within them, and that is one of the elements in our debate today. We are talking about these corporations getting into buying and selling and that sort of thing.

I am sure that many of the Hon. Members on the other side of the House have not read this particular Bill and realize the dangers which lie within it. Nor, Mr. Speaker, does it appear that they have seen or examined in any way at all the proliferation, the spawning nature, of a Crown corporation once it gets into the hands of an ambitious bureaucracy which does not have to come back to the House of Commons or Parliament to account for its expenditures and its operations.

I wonder how many Members could tell me, including the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), how many corporations