

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

statutes. The minister went on to say, as reported at page 7002 of *Hansard*:

—the federal government cannot enact supply management legislation on the production side. This has been ruled ultra vires once or twice by the Supreme Court. It therefore has to be done by the province.

The government's own task force warned him against any attempt of this kind, yet the minister goes ahead and introduces this bill. Naturally, the question that follows is: Why does clause 22 and clause 2 (e) (v) of the bill refer to the term "production"? We know from previous experience how the government has disregarded the terms of the British North America Act, or any rule or regulation used in this House, as a guide. The government uses them only when it suits its purpose to do so.

Most of us in this House remember the government's efforts regarding the official languages bill. In spite of the fact that many believed the languages bill to be unconstitutional, because of their numbers the government bulldozed the bill through the House, refusing to submit it to the courts for a legal opinion before final approval was given. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they forced the bill through in spite of the fact that no less a person than one who had held the second highest judicial position in this country vigorously maintained that the bill was unconstitutional.

We also know the action the government took regarding the Criminal Code amendments, the hate literature bill and the white paper on tax reform. We know the statements made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in regard to the white paper on tax reform while speaking to a Liberal audience in Toronto not too long ago. I have picked out three sentences which were the meat of his address; everything else was camouflage. The Prime Minister said:

We will not be bullied or blackmailed by hysterical charges and threats.

Such tactics will not distinct us from the fundamental objective of our reform.

Then his third statement was:

In many ways, our white papers introduce a new concept of government for Canada.

Are not the people of Canada entitled to know what that new concept is? Is it state control? That is the message he gave the people of Canada. As I have said, the rest of his speech was camouflage. His objective—and his message—is a new concept of government for Canada. Bill C-197 is one more step toward his goal of complete state control.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

• (8:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, as hon. members opposite may have realized, there really are two reasons for being somewhat chary in one's support of this bill even though the major concept of it is one with which most members opposite could agree. First, the bill does not permit the producer as of right a say in the operation of the marketing mechanisms it establishes. The second major reason is that the legislation has not been placed within a context, and I shall come to that in a moment. The legislation gives the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) great powers, but at this moment we are not sure what he intends to do with those powers. Moreover, we have every reason to suspect that the proposed legislation, under the direction of this government, will be employed as an additional device to force bona fide farmers off the land to the benefit of corporate farming enterprises.

The ostensible purpose of Bill C-197 is to establish a National Farm Products Marketing Council and national marketing agencies for farm products. It is to provide the council and its agencies with terms of reference, staff and the finances necessary to carry out their responsibilities. Hopefully, the machinery thus established will be employed to stabilize commodity prices and strengthen farm producer bargaining power in the economy. However, both the legislation and the minister's introductory remarks leave us in some doubt about the purpose of the legislation. This is what we would hope it would be employed for, but we are by no means sure.

We in the New Democratic Party are wholeheartedly in favour of the concept of national commodity marketing boards with which provincial producer-controlled marketing boards could conform and thereby be able to market products in any part of Canada and in the export markets. We see such a device as one of several steps which must be taken in order to introduce some stability in commodity pricing. Indeed, at the 1967 biennial convention of the New Democratic Party a clause was included in a resolution adopted on the subject of agriculture which read in part, "orderly marketing of farm commodities must be established by"—and there were several mechanisms presented. One was "by providing federal legislation to establish the machinery for national marketing with which provincial producer-controlled marketing boards could conform and thereby be able to market products in any part of Canada or the export market."