could say more, but we are not here to discuss operation LIFT. We are here to discuss this particular bill.

I refer to page 5 of the bill which reads:

(1) The duties of the Council are

(a) to advise the Minister on all matters relating to the establishment and operation of agencies under this Act with a view to maintaining and promoting an efficient and competitive agriculture industry;

I wish to emphasize the words "an efficient and competitive agriculture industry." Before the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) visited Saskatchewan in February, the grain industry in Saskatchewan and in the rest of western Canada was an efficient and competitive industry. No one denies that fact. This bill says, "maintaining and promoting an efficient and competitive agriculture industry". What does it omit? Only the people.

Even though there may be an efficient and competitive agriculture industry, there may still be a lot of people who are hard up. I have looked through this bill in vain trying to find a place where it proposes to attempt to maintain the income of the people on the land. There is no such statement in this bill. This is not an objective of the people who will be the commissioners or administrators. According to this bill, they are not to be concerned with the income level of the people on the land. The bill further states:

(2) (b) have regard to the interests of consumers of farm products and of those engaged in the marketing thereof as well as to the interests of producers of farm products.

The producers of farm products are not mentioned first, Mr. Speaker. The consumers of farm products in this nation have done very well. The consumers of farm products in this nation pay a smaller percentage of their income for food than do the consumers in almost any other country among the developed nations. The consumers are able to buy products that are sorted, crated, washed and packaged. If there is anything more that can be done to make the product more presentable to the consumer, that is done. These are the services the consumer is receiving today from the distributors of farm products in Canada, yet in this sentence that I referred to the producer is mentioned last.

I wonder why the government found it necessary, in introducing this bill, to very carefully state that the interests, of the consumer will be carefully protected. Has the consumer been that badly abused? If so, where and when? Beef is imported from New Zealand so that the consumers in eastern Canada will not be forced to pay high prices. Last year the amount of beef imported from New Zealand was tripled. Great care is taken to ensure that the consumer is not at the mercy of the farmer or rancher on the North American continent. Alternative supplies are available.

The bill also refers to "those engaged in the marketing thereof". They also take precedence over the producer. Those who have been doing the marketing have not done that badly. I refer to those marketing our grain, the elevator companies and the brokerage people. They are guaranteed a return that is sufficient to enable their operations to run very smoothly. They have not been suffering that much. The packing industry slaughters, processes and packages our beef and hogs. It packages our eggs. This industry has managed very well, Mr. Speaker, yet in this bill it has a special place.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Under this bill control can be exercised over any farm product. Clause 17 provides:

The Governor in Council may by proclamation establish an agency with powers relating to any farm product or farm products the marketing of which in interprovincial and export trade is not regulated pursuant to the Canadian Wheat Board Act or the Canadian Dairy Commission Act.

This means that the agency will have power over practically any farm product in Canada, with the exception of wheat, barley and oats.

Clause 19 provides:

The members of an agency shall be appointed by the Governor in Council to hold office during pleasure.

As I said before, the bill makes no provision for producer participation. The agencies can operate without it. I thought I heard it said that these powers were given to the provincial governments, but this is not the case with regard to marketing grain. The government found it quite possible to get around any provincial participation here. Never has a member of the Wheat Board been elected by the producers: all have been appointed by the federal government. There are at least three different types of operation in connection with the marketing of hogs, one of which is a commission in Manitoba.

So as I see it, this bill gives the agency concerned the power to do almost anything with any given agricultural product. Unless provision is made within the bill for partici-