

service. Indeed, they have been urging the government to restore it.

These are seemingly simple matters on the surface, but it is the little things which destroy the quality of service. I am sure hon. members will agree that if we have a happy public, we have a happy employee.

The Postmaster General is not with us this evening. He was not present when I spoke on the last occasion, July 17, just before the House adjourned. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Mr. Marceau) replied. His words of wisdom, as recorded at page 5730 of *Hansard*, began as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I will not take up the nonsensical accusations of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) because the government has no time to waste.

I remind him and this arrogant government that it has all the time in the world to waste because it is living on borrowed time. If it does not deal with fundamental matters such as efficient postal service that affects every citizen of Canada, in a very short time it will have all the time in the world to twiddle its thumbs, as it is doing at the present time.

[Translation]

Mr. Léopold Corriveau (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to reply to the hon. member on behalf of the Postmaster General (Mr. Ouellet).

The purpose of this questionnaire was to discover the causes of the relatively high rate of personnel turnover, that is 10 per cent.

Last June, this questionnaire was sent to the Calgary area. To my knowledge, this is the only place where such a questionnaire was used.

In their desire to improve relations with their employees, Post Office Department officials sent out these questions, which concern the department in general, supervision, conditions of work, training, promotion opportunities, descriptions of duties, shift assignments, etc.

Fifty replies have now been received. These answers are now being analysed.

Since this questionnaire deals with an internal problem and is of limited scope, I do not think it necessary that it be made public.

[English]

AGRICULTURE—POSITION OF CANADA ON NEW
INTERNATIONAL GRAINS AGREEMENT—REQUEST FOR
STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Mr. Bill Knight (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, as usual I have my loyal audience at this hour thanks to an immense amount of co-operation between the House leader and the whips.

I rise to call attention to a question which has been aired in the last few days and which deserves to be restated. It relates to whether or not the government is taking any initiative toward establishing an international wheat agreement or an international grains agreement. The last time I asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan)

Adjournment Debate

whether moves were being made in this direction he told us he was looking into the matter but that he had to attend a meeting of provincial ministers of agriculture in Charlottetown, and, following that, of provincial premiers in Calgary. After his devastatingly poor showing there it is incumbent upon the government to outline the steps it is taking in an effort to establish international agreements respecting wheat and grains.

Steps in this direction should be taken now because the suppliers, the exporters of grain, Canada among them, are presently in a position to take the initiative. I refer to the fact that the World Agricultural Council has reported that world production is likely to fall at least 200 million bushels short of world demand. In such circumstances we as Canadians should take it upon ourselves to press for an international agreement under which producing countries are guaranteed a reasonable price over a period of time, and importing countries are assured of some certainty of supply. In other words, there would be some order in the world grain market the result of which would be to provide a measure of security to Canadian farmers.

I bring up this question tonight bearing in mind that the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization has called the world's major wheat exporting nations to a meeting on September 10 to seek means of alleviating the consequences of the shortfall in world cereal supply. Canada is obviously one of the nations involved and it should be incumbent on the government to bring up the question of international wheat and grains agreements.

In addition, one or other of the ministers concerned should outline to the House, or at least to the Standing Committee on Agriculture, the direction government policy is taking in terms of the international situation, so as to bring some order into the marketing of grain for the benefit not only of Canadian farmers but also of the millions of hungry people in the world.

• (2210)

Further, on the issue of grain, for the first time in a long time the people of Canada are starting to realize the fundamental importance of farm production in terms of food supply in this country. If this government is going to make this kind of a move with relation to grains it should not do so until it is enunciated and discussed in the Standing Committee on Agriculture or on a statement on motions in this House of Commons.

I need mention only a few points. What are they doing in world negotiations on trade? What are they doing on the international scene and in respect of an international grains agreement? Why do we not have a full airing and discussion of the policy enunciated the other day when the western farmer at this point in time is subsidizing the consumer by \$1.15 due to the maximum price of \$4.50 and the minimum price of \$3.25? Ten months ago I asked why this government was not changing its two-price system and subsidies because the wheat producers in my area were being left out.

If we are to be called upon to do this kind of thing by the government, then it is incumbent upon the government to give the representatives of those people a full opportunity to air and discuss measures of that type. Further, this government ignored a meeting of all ten