

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Acting Minister of National Revenue):** I should like to point out that the Minister of National Revenue will be in the House tomorrow.

\* \* \*

#### POWER

##### SKAGIT RIVER—ACTION TO PREVENT FLOODING OF VALLEY

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** My question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Is he or some other minister planning to announce any government action in the near future relating to the flooding of the Skagit Valley in British Columbia?

**Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** The matter is under consideration by the government but no announcement is planned for today. If an announcement is to be made it will be made in the House in the normal and proper fashion.

**Mr. Rose:** Since west coast news sources indicate that a judicial inquiry is imminent, can the minister tell us whether such an inquiry is, in fact, contemplated?

**Mr. Greene:** The entire matter is under review, including any aspects in which the federal government has a proper constitutional role which it might or should take under consideration. If any action is contemplated, it will be announced in the proper manner.

\* \* \*

#### FINANCE

##### REDUCTION IN DEPARTMENTAL PUBLIC RELATIONS BUDGETS BECAUSE OF OPERATIONS OF INFORMATION CANADA

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board. In light of the announcement yesterday that Information Canada will be taking over the organizing and developing of each individual public relations program in the various government departments, can the minister tell us whether he expects there will be a reduction in the individual budgets of each department accordingly?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** What do you think?

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board):** As a consequence of setting up Information Canada it would be expected that economies would be achieved in the operation of individual departmental information units.

**An hon. Member:** You are not serious.

**Mr. Bell:** Will the minister check? Will he make certain that he gives us the size of the reduction within each department, because everybody in the Press Gallery who wants a job in the government is now getting one?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

#### Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING AGENCIES BILL

##### ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MARKETING COUNCIL AND AGENCIES

The House resumed from Monday, November 2, consideration of the motion of Mr. Olson that Bill C-176, to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned yesterday I was commenting on some of the amendments which the minister suggested might go forward in connection with this bill. One of the most important suggestions was that the bill might be amended so that any possibility of marketing beef cattle or calves under this legislation would be removed. It seems to me rather strange that the minister would indicate he is in favour of emasculating the bill by removing from it the potential to achieve the very objectives which he has repeatedly said in the committee and in this House are the objectives of the legislation.

• (2:50 p.m.)

On being questioned in the committee, the minister stated that one of the objectives of this bill is to correct the present balkanization which is taking place and has taken place in agricultural trade in this country. He said it is designed to correct the situation where one province can say to another: You cannot bring this product into the province. When he was asked about taking this problem to the Supreme Court for decision, he said he did not propose to go to the Supreme Court to correct the situation.

The minister has deliberately brought in a piece of legislation which eliminates one of our main agricultural products, and informs the House that he has the answer to the situation which exists. How do we know whether a year or two years from now one of the provinces of Canada will not decide that it does not choose to allow the sale of beef cattle or calves from other parts of Canada in that province? Should that occur, there would be no possibility of dealing with the situation under this act if the proposed amendments are made. These are the clear implications of this amendment.

I refer to a copy of the proceedings of a press conference in which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated the policy of this government in reference to the possibility of solving the present problems of marketing agricultural farm products between provinces. The prime minister said:

I don't have the reference to what Mr. Olson said, but the federal position is that of course we have no objection to a reference to the Supreme Court as a matter of principle, but we don't think it would be the right solution in practice, because the reference would take a lot of time and if the bill on marketing legislation which is now before the federal parliament, and which was prevented from passing by some opposition members before the summer adjournment, if we can get it through when parliament reconvenes, it will be much better than going through the Supreme Court—