

Then it goes on to say what should be the order of reference to the commission of Judge Turgeon. So there is evidence that it was not unanimous except with the understanding, "As the committee finds it impracticable to obtain conclusive evidence on this point we recommend that this matter be referred for further investigation to the royal commission." So it was not unanimous. We could not get conclusive evidence. It was referred to a royal commission on that account.

Mr. McNEVIN: You got the royal commission. Let us have the question.

Mr. PERLEY: The order of reference of that committee was not the same as this order of reference at all. Mr. Chairman, I think that the minister and Mr. McIvor should agree to bring it up to date or else withdraw all this stuff about there being a charge. They are only being asked for information.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. PERLEY: If you bring it up to date, all right.

Mr. DONNELLY: Mr. Chairman, just a word before going further. Mr. Perley has said that this was referred to a royal commission. I have here the report of the royal commission and this is in the order of reference, as appears from the first paragraph:—

The methods now or heretofore employed in marketing Canadian Grains abroad, including Government Grain Boards, co-operative or pool marketing, price stabilization measures and the open market or competitive method; and the effect of these various methods upon markets.

The whole matter of marketing grain was referred to this commission.

Mr. PERLEY: To the Turgeon commission.

Mr. DONNELLY: The same thing as, I was saying, we are investigating here—the method of marketing by open markets or by using the facilities of the trade.

Mr. PERLEY: But not this committee.

Mr. DONNELLY: I want to say this in connection with what is going on. I turn over to page 188 and I notice an excerpt of the evidence of Mr. J. R. Murray. I want to read this for the information of the committee:—

The criticism which has been directed against our operations illustrates what will always be one of the greatest difficulties confronting any government board, namely, satisfying the producer and parliament. Wheat is a commodity subject to the play of constantly changing conditions. In selling wheat the very nature of the problem—when, how much, and at what price to sell—is such that there must always be differences of opinion as to the best course to follow. Any board has to reach decisions and act in the light of facts and possibility as they see them and honest criticism, no matter how severe, need not be a cause of concern to anyone. There is another class of criticism. Some individuals for reasons best known to themselves, make their contribution to our wheat problem in the form of speeches or statements containing what can only be described as false statements. As people will listen to them and believe them, ignoring them simply assists them in killing the operation of the system they profess to uphold. It may be important to assess the probable effect of continued criticism on any future wheat board in their handling of the particular marketing problems that they will have to deal with from time to time.

Then Judge Turgeon says:

It is perhaps impossible to exclude any government appointed body from public criticism; but the fact that the members of such a body will sometimes believe and feel that the criticism to which they are