

agriculture, producers, consumers, packers and so forth. A series of 10 hearings across the country was held.

The committee heard the views of producers, consumers, business people, trade officials, academics, provincial ministers of agriculture and other government officials. Our thanks go to the organizations and individuals who made representations.

From these presentations it was clearly evident that, although the industry was in serious difficulty and stability was a desired objective, there was no agreement on solutions to problems. Two principles were formulated: First, Canada needs and must have a strong and viable beef industry; and secondly, beef industry policy approaches must be flexible and developmental.

Considering the significant differences of opinion among beef producers, the committee did not see fit to force the issue or polarize the industry further.

Many of the concerns and problems presented by producers and other witnesses pointed to the fact that there was no vehicle which has the mandate to deal with them. In response, the committee recommends the establishment of a National Beef Producers Agency through an amendment to the Farm Products Marketing Agencies Act, which agency would be made up principally of producer representatives working in close co-operation with provincial governments. It would not have price-setting or quota-granting powers, but would act on behalf of producers in a co-ordinating, an informational and an advisory role. The committee notes that such an agency could serve as the basis of a marketing board, if producers should choose to take this step.

The committee further recommends that the Government of Canada investigate the advisability of establishing income-averaging programs which would create a capital pool for beef operation financing at favourable interest rates.

Honourable senators, I commend the report to you.

● (1440)

The Hon. the Speaker: As no other honourable senator wishes to speak, this report is considered debated.

THE SENATE

REFORM—MOTION RE ELECTION OF MEMBERS—DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from Wednesday, May 12, the debate on the motion of Senator Roblin:

That this House affirms that the federal character of representative and responsible government in Canada will be strengthened if the membership of the Senate is constituted by election rather than by appointment.

Hon. Orville H. Phillips: Honourable senators, when I read Senator Roblin's announcement in the press and then saw his television appearances, I decided he was taking a Madison Avenue approach. On the evening he gave notice of his motion, I looked up to the south gallery and saw there the honourable member for Nepean-Carleton, Mr. Walter Baker. I commented to one of my colleagues that he must have come here to

[Senator Bielish.]

practise counting. My colleague looked up, and said, "No, he's not using his fingers and he doesn't have a tutor with him." However, I noticed that the honourable member stayed until the motion was presented and then he left. Obviously, he did not find the Senate any more stimulating than the House of Commons.

Then, of course, Senator Frith could not let all the publicity go by, and he had to get into the act, too, for if the Senate was to be reformed he was going to be in the forefront. Senator Frith did fairly well in extending that forefront, because he now has it reaching from the North Pole to the South Pole, and he has stretched it into a freebie to Australia. I can understand now why he is so anxious to be in the forefront. The reason I have carried this order in my name for some time is that I was hoping that the honourable senator would ask to precede me, thereby giving me the benefit of his views before I spoke. Obviously, I am not going to get that opportunity, so I will go ahead without the benefit of his views.

I think Senator Frith is providing a Mackenzie King type leadership, namely, see which way the sheep are going and then get in front.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): That is why I was waiting for you.

Senator Phillips: That is why the honourable senator went first class to Australia with the sheep.

Senator Frith: I did not go first class. That must have been another trip.

Senator Phillips: And, of course, the then Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition could not be overshadowed by the deputy leaders, and they had to go along on the trip too. I do not resent that, but I am a bit curious to know why Senator Buckwold went along. Someone should have invited the seconder of the motion, Senator Deschatelets. I think he should have gone instead of Senator Buckwold.

Hon. Jack Marshall: Oh, well, perhaps some others can still go first class.

Senator Phillips: I would like to suggest to those honourable senators who had the freebie that they give an equal chance to those opposed to an elected Senate to go and investigate how it works and, perhaps, the freebie could be extended to include some countries that have appointed Senates. I am thinking of Holland and, I believe, Thailand. Certainly, that would be an excellent trip for the mover of the motion and Senator Frith.

The two deputy leaders are saying that they are anxious for reform and for an elected Senate, and at the same time they are saying that the Senate as it exists has done a wonderful job. They really have not given any reasons for an elected Senate. Before we get too enthusiastic, we should hear some specific reasons for putting in place an elected Senate. I think it is a sign of parliamentary arteriosclerosis, or plain old-fashioned hardening of the arteries, that at a time when the economy is in a state of depression, and there is record unemployment, a housing crisis and all sorts of immediate problems facing this country, we are discussing the election of