He further made the statement that he will, and I quote:

—implement, with possible changes, the Agricultural Export Corporation announced by the Liberal Cabinet during the election campaign as a tool to sell Canadian food abroad.

Underline the word "sell". He further stated concerning the agriculture export corporation, which would have powers similar to the Canadian Wheat Board, that he would refer it to that part of his ministry, but after talking with ministry officials, he thinks that may be impossible. He said that, because of the business nature of that structure, it may be necessary to have a Crown corporation. He further said:

I won't quibble over that.

On November 9 we were again briefed by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, which I respect as a very strong spokesgroup for the farmers of Canada. They were very emphatic about their support for the establishment of a Canadian agriculture corporation known as Canagrex. We have had representations from another national body, the National Farmers' Union, in which they very much supported the establishment of that corporation.

Another very strong body of representatives for the Quebec agriculture group, the UPA, very much supports this Crown corporation being formed. The Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers Association, which represents the entire tobacco area, totally supports the establishment of a Crown corporation, as does the White Bean Growers Association. I could go on and on listing such respected organizations who speak on behalf of the farmers.

● (1700)

I question very much what has happened in this House to deprive us as Members of being able to speak on a very important subject which the farmers want, and that is the formation of their own Canadian agriculture export corporation. The Conservative Party has now questioned the credibility of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. They are questioning the credibility of these people in speaking for the farmers, but it seems strange that the only time we hear about agriculture in this House is on behalf of those people who are not farmers themselves.

Time is very limited to speak on this, but I hope that on final reading I would have a chance to bring forward further proof that the Canadian farmer wants this corporation. It is time now to speak for the farmer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I am sorry to have put some pressure on the Hon. Member, but it is past five o'clock and we should be entering into Private Member's Hour.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Member's business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, Private Bills, Notices of Motions and Public Bills.

There being no items on the Order Paper under the heading of Private Bills, the House will now proceed to Notices of Motions, Papers.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*English*]

All items preceding No. 88 allowed to stand by unanimous consent.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT REVIEW AGENCY

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil) moved:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all agreements, correspondence, notes and other communications relating to the requirement by the Foreign Investment Review Agency that Tate and Lyall Limited reduce its shareholdings in Redpath Sugar Limited.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as I rise on what will probably be the last opportunity to discuss a motion for the production of papers, I do not discern any noticeable period of mourning for the end of this antiquated procedure. And I would hasten to say that when I call it an antiquated procedure it is because of its ineffectiveness and not because of its intent. The intent when originally conceived was that it would be a means by which a Member would be able to pressure the Government to produce documents, and the reason for the production of documents is to give information. The Member, in effect, is seeking information.

As a Member of the Committee which has introduced the new regulations which come into effect after the New Year, and which will see all Private Members' business discussed on Wednesday afternon, it is abundantly apparent to me that the probability is that the Members will choose as their subject their Bills and motions, and it is unlikely that motions for the production of papers will be discussed in the coming year.

I should at this point distinguish or record the essential difference between the Bills or motions of Members and motions for the production of documents. A Bill or a motion is a representation. The Bill is an attempt either to introduce legislation or to change legislation; the motion itself is an attempt to put pressure on the Government to take some course of action. The motion for the production of papers, of course, is a desire of Members to obtain information.

As I have said in committee discussions, we can then proceed via a question on the Order Paper to obtain the information which we seek. However, I am sure that the Members of the Opposition particularly will immediately say it is sometimes not as productive as it should be, that questions are not answered, information is not forthcoming, and I cannot help but agree, because reviewing the Order Paper I see that I have questions going back over a year. These questions are important to me particularly, and I believe probably to other Members.

I have complained many times that one of our problems at the present time with the Public Service is that we have been unable to introduce Public Service legislation. Over a year ago I did ask for information pertaining to the Public Service Employment Act and that question still remains on the Order