Mr. Malone: The minister in charge of the Wheat Board agreed, when appearing before the Standing Committee on Agriculture, that the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Moose Jaw was acceptable. Actually he said that he agreed with the spirit of that amendment, agreed that there should be some guarantee that farmers would be on the advisory board. Unfortunately, ten government members, not one of whom represents ridings within the Canadian Wheat Board growing area, at a later date, not knowing the minister's position, chose to vote against the amendment. That was unfortunate. Farm people again are being jeopardized because people from outside the Canadian Wheat Board growing area have made a decision without understanding the agricultural industry. They did not extend their trust to those in that industry. Really it is not a matter of whether farm people should be on the board; it is a matter of whether the government is willing to extend trust to farmers. The other part of the question is, why is the government so distrustful? Why is it not willing to let farmers have some persuasive say in the management of their own affairs?

We need to reverse trends in this country. Instead of building structures and institutions and imposing them on people, it is high time we encouraged Canadians to take a more active and responsible role in the administration of their own lives.

I conclude by saying that while I think most of this bill is satisfactory, I wish the government would see fit to extend more trust and responsibility to farmers within the Canadian Wheat Board growing area.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I should like for a few moments this afternoon to speak generally on Bill C-88, but before I do that may I deal with the arguments advanced earlier by the two hon. gentlemen who have just spoken.

In particular I refer to the argument they are making about the amendment which was proposed in committee and later at report stage by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) having to do with the restrictions which that particular member wanted to place in this legislation. It is interesting to note the contrast between what the hon. member for Moose Jaw was in fact proposing and the rhetoric of the two hon. members who have just spoken.

• (1610)

The point is that that amendment would have restricted the range of choice of farmers in selecting people to represent them upon the advisory committee of the Canadian Wheat Board. The amendment would have restricted their freedom of choice. It would cut down their range of choice. The argument presented to the House in opposition to that amendment, the argument which persuaded itself to the House, was that we should leave the range of options broad and general for farmers when making their selection of producers or others to represent them.

Mr. Towers: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) a question. Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Goodale: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Canadian Wheat Board Act (No. 2)

Mr. Towers: If it was a bad amendment, why did the minister in charge of the wheat board agree with it in committee?

Mr. Malone: That was my question too.

Mr. Goodale: In the committee hearings that were cited in this House when the bill was debated at the report stage, hon. members opposite chose only to read those selected portions of the committee minutes which supported their case. They stopped short of reading the full context of what was said.

Mr. Malone: You were not there.

Mr. Goodale: When you read all of those minutes, as I have read them very carefully word for word, you find out very clearly what transpired in the committee. The members of that committee drew to the attention of the committee certain aspects that were being overlooked in the amendment being proposed by the hon. member for Moose Jaw.

The point is this. The amendment would have restricted the freedom of choice and the range of options of producers. The committee, and later this House, opted at the initial stage of establishing this new election procedure, for a broad range of choice for farmers. The ultimate protection is in the legislation. When an election is held to select the advisers to the Canadian Wheat Board, that election is squarely, fully, and solely in the hands of producers. They are the ones who have the franchise. They are the ones who will make the ultimate decision. I have every confidence in the ability, capacity, and good judgment of farmers that when they exercise their franchise they will make the right decision in their own best interest. They do not need this kind of artificial protection which would limit the freedom and range of choice they would otherwise have.

In Bill C-88 this House of Commons is being called upon to amend in two specific and postive respects the legislation which forms the foundation of the system of marketing for most of our western Canadian grain production, namely, the Canadian Wheat Board Act. It is clearly understood that these changes are being proposed in direct response to the clear expression of opinion of prairie farmers.

Primarily this bill seeks to achieve two quite separate objectives. First, clauses 1 and 3 of Bill C-88 deal essentially with the provision of a permanent basis for the election of advisers by prairie grain producers to the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee.

Second, clause 4 of the bill makes provision for the establishment of separate marketing pools, within the wheat board structure, for certain selected and accepted grains, such as malting barley.

The remaining sections of the bill, namely clauses 2 and 5, are of a technical housekeeping nature, unrelated to the two major amendments I have just mentioned, which correct errors in wording or minor anomalies which presently appear in the act.

As we conclude this debate, may I comment just briefly on the two essential highlights contained in Bill C-88; first, the matter of a separate CWB marketing pool for malting