

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

No. 26, the entire line-up of these 30 motions which you have set out meets with our approval.

Mr. Speaker: Then that is agreed and so ordered. I might suggest to the House that the voting procedures will have to be changed in that motions Nos. 5 and 22 will have to be called with the first group of motions on which there will be divisions. It had been suggested by the Chair that the vote on motions Nos. 5 and 22 be taken later. Are hon. members agreeable to this suggestion?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. I do not know whether it ought to be raised now or when we reach motion No. 9. On reading *Hansard* I noted that the comment was made that all of the amendments were considered to be in order with the exception that some reservation was expressed about motion No. 30. I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention that motion No. 9 was in fact moved in the committee and declared to be out of order because it exceeded the recommendation of the Governor General. I wonder whether you would take that point into consideration in deciding whether motion No. 9 is in order here.

Mr. Speaker: The minister recognizes, of course, that the Chair is not bound by a ruling which may have been made in committee. If when motion No. 9 is reached the minister wishes to raise this point, he can reserve the right at this time to raise it by way of a point of order and the decision might then be taken whether the motion should be put and debated. For the moment the Chair is required, under the rules, to put motions Nos. 5 and 22, which are to be considered together with motion No. 1.

The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) moves motion No. 5 as follows:

That Bill C-176, an act to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, be amended by deleting paragraph (ii) of subclause (g) of clause 2 at page 3.

The motion will, of course, be put later. The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) also moves motion No. 22 as follows:

• (3:50 p.m.)

That Bill C-176, an act to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, be amended

(a) by adding to subparagraph (ii) paragraph (a) of subclause (1) of clause 18 the word "such" after the word "any" at line 13, page 12 and by deleting from the subparagraph all the words after the word "proclamation" at line 14; and

(b) by adding to subparagraph (ii) paragraph (a) of subclause (2) of clause 18 the word "such" after the word "any" at line 6, page 13 and by deleting from the subparagraph all the words after the word "proclamation" at line 7.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, in my remarks last evening I drew attention to the fact that I did not want to proceed with this item at a time when neither the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) nor the chairman of the agricultural committee were in attendance. I felt an important bill such as this should not be proceeded with unless one of the authorities responsible

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

for bringing it before the House was present to take part in the debate or to at least listen to the remarks of hon. members.

One hears a great deal about Bill C-176, particularly that it is an all-powerful piece of legislation which takes much of the decision-making from the farmers and gives it to the government. It is interesting to note what was said by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) at a Liberal party meeting back in 1963. He said that power is what they are interested in. The only kick allowed is that which comes from a donkey. Some say it does not matter. He also said at that time: Say anything and think anything you like, but put us in power because we are best suited to govern.

As a result of this bill in the name of the Minister of Agriculture it is interesting to note how quickly the Prime Minister has changed from an NDP supporter to a Liberal supporter. He wants power and he does not want anybody to interfere with this power. When the Minister of Agriculture attempted to interfere by removing cattle from the coverage of this bill he was not allowed to do so because the Prime Minister did not want it. Last night I referred to proceedings No. 7 of the committee, page 18, where the minister is reported as having said:

On September 16, 1970, I quote:

12. The first ministers also considered current problems which were being encountered in the interprovincial marketing of certain agricultural products.

13. The conference received a report that Bill C-197, the farm products marketing agencies bill which is at present before Parliament, would enable national marketing boards to be established which could help to meet the marketing problems being encountered. It was noted that the bill would provide for delegation of both federal and provincial authority to the marketing boards. It was observed also that while Bill C-197 had been generally agreed to by provincial Ministers of Agriculture, the federal government was ready at this time to consider suggestions which provinces might wish to offer for amendments to the bill. It was the consensus also that it would be appropriate for the bill to exclude beef cattle from the jurisdiction of such marketing agencies.

I emphasize these words to make it abundantly clear that the provinces agreed to this bill under certain conditions. One of the conditions was that cattle would be excluded. In my amendment I suggest that all products be excluded from the provisions of legislation until such time as the provinces agree. This would then in a true sense be enabling legislation: it would be there for use only if the producers wanted to use it.

The Prime Minister stated quite clearly in his Winnipeg speech that there must be agreement with the province regarding jurisdiction in marketing under this legislative proposal. There is no unanimity by the provinces regarding this bill. Representatives of Newfoundland informed the committee that this bill was ultra vires and they wanted no part of it. Mr. Thatcher said that so long as he was in office in Saskatchewan no part of Bill C-176 would be used in that province. Mr. Strom of Alberta suggested that red meat should be excluded from the bill. Manitoba is taking the whole matter to the Supreme Court of Canada which has now agreed to hear the case, and other governments have until May 21 to file their arguments in support of Manitoba's case.