Responding to a Need". The document was prepared at the taxpayers' expense during the summer when the Minister felt there were problems with the Bill.

This is the propaganda document that was distributed to a limited number of organizations and people to try to convince them to put pressure, I assume, on their Members of Parliament to pass the legislation. I do not know how many thousands of dollars this document cost, but it is pure propaganda. It even contains some news items about Canagrex.

Can you imagine a Minister of the Crown spending the taxpayers' money to try to sell a Bill that he is unable to sell, spending thousands of dollars on this document? He did not give Opposition Members the opportunity to spend taxpayers' money to tell their side of the story. He did not allow us the same privilege that he had. If a Minister of the Crown has to spend thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money on propaganda to promote a Bill that is in the process of being discussed in the House, there must be something wrong with that Bill, but that is what he has done.

After 90 minutes' debate, the Minister comes into the House and says there has been too much debate, time will have to be limited. It is interesting to note that when this Bill was in the Standing Committee on Agriculture, it was pointed out to the Minister and Members on the Governement side that there are two Departments doing exactly the same work that it is proposed Canagrex will do, Industry, Trade and Commerce and External Affairs.

We tried to find out why the Minister was trying to press Canagrex and set up a third organization to sell. In Committee I proposed that we invite representatives from the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce or perhaps the Minister and that we invite representatives from External Affairs and perhaps the Minister to tell us what they are doing. The Committee could then say that as there are three different organizations that will be involved in selling agricultural products, maybe we should discuss this, maybe we can end up strengthening Industry, Trade and Commerce and there will be no need for Canagrex, or maybe we can strengthen External Affairs and there will be no need for Industry, Trade and Commerce or Canagrex. What happened? Members on the Government side said we could not invite those people, they might give evidence that would indicate that Canagrex is not necessary, so let us set up a third organization at taxpayers' expense, they will all be in competition and then we will do a proper job.

Mr. Gustafson: Triple the cost.

Mr. Neil: As my learned friend says, "triple the cost".

The Minister talks of democracy. He would not allow those witnesses. He would not allow the only two organizations from Saskatchewan that requested to be witnesses. They were turned down. He said that we have already representations from Saskatchewan. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture gave evidence and it represents many organizations in Saskatchewan. It is an umbrella organization. But, Mr. Speaker, there were two organizations from Saskatchewan involved in agriculture which requested permission to attend, and the Minister said no. At least, Members on the Government said no, and, obviously, when they said no, they were acting on instructions from the Government.

• (2010)

I see my time is almost up, Mr. Speaker, so I will simply close by saying that Hon. Members on this side of the House are shocked, and I am sure the people across Canada will be shocked, to learn that the Minister of Agriculture of this country would try to force a Bill of this kind on the people of Canada without adequate debate in this House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Dubois (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the motion before us this evening and which we will be voting on in a few minutes, I am always amazed to hear Hon. Members on the other side of the House, especially those of the Official Opposition, say that they did not have enough time to debate a bill when actually they wasted hours and hours on several occasions before the Committee on Agriculture with their procedural arguments. During some of the meetings which I attended, they kept introducing motion after motion to have this or that witness heard, debating the motions and urging that a group be heard when that group had not even asked to appear before the Committee. I take it with a grain of salt when I hear them complaining that they did not have enough time to debate a bill, or that the Committee should have spent more time on one clause or another. Mr. Speaker, we did spend several hours on second reading of this bill, and so did the Committee on Agriculture. We spent hours listening to witnesses who had asked to give evidence before that Committee, and indeed they were heard. Members opposite say that they were not given the chance to hear certain organizations which wanted to give evidence, as a result of rather shady deals they wanted to make. As I just said, those organizations had not asked to be there, so the Opposition resorted to delaying tactics to bog down the Committee proceedings. They told the Committee that if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) could agree to the presence of a certain individual or group, they would refrain from introducing this or that amendment. I see on the other side of the House some Members who were at that meeting and who, one after the other, did introduce three or four motions and asked that they be debated separately. In the end, we had not made any progress. Mr. Speaker, I have not been a Member here for very long, but there is no way I can describe their approach other than to say that they used delaying tactics to prevent a Bill from being reported to the House. However, what I find interesting about the situation of agriculture, and especially as concerns the Canadian Federation of Agriculture which we met early in November, is that the Federation told us:

The Canagrex issue is of serious concern to the CFA. We believe it desirable for such an export corporation to be fully flexible to promote the development of Canadian exports, to accept the risks of joint endeavours, to provide specialized