

logy of transportation and product handling. To meet this situation and to complement the action of provincial boards through the provision of a basis for orderly inter-provincial and export marketing the government proposes to introduce special legislation to provide for commodity marketing boards as the particular need for each commodity becomes evident.

I underline the words "as the particular need for each commodity becomes evident". One can clearly see that as early as June 2, 1968, the government was fully prepared to bring in legislation such as Bill C-176, or Bill C-197 as it was called in the first instance. The government was prepared to do so as a particular need in respect of each commodity became evident. My amendment clearly spells out that no commodity shall be encompassed by the bill until a need becomes evident to the producers.

Clause 17 clearly establishes that the majority of producers must request that they be included. In his speech of June 2, 1968, the Prime Minister left open the question who should determine when the need was evident. Of course, one can rest assured that a power-hungry government will do the determining. Nevertheless, we now have the concept accepted in the bill that the producers themselves shall determine whether or not they should be included.

Toward the end of his remarks on the occasion to which I have referred, the Prime Minister stated:

In order to meet the difficulties of divided jurisdiction in the area of the marketing of agricultural products, the government would undertake to raise for discussion with the provinces the possibility of providing over-all authority for the marketing of agricultural products as a federal responsibility.

The government did hold discussions with the provinces. But today there is no unanimity with regard to Bill C-176. Newfoundland said the bill was ultra vires; they did not believe the federal government had the authority to enforce it. The Saskatchewan Premier said the other day to his people: Don't worry about the bill. As long as I am Premier it will never come into force in this province. The Premier of Alberta, Mr. Strom, said just the other day: I want red meats excluded. A common definition of that term would be beef, pork and sheep products, basically lamb and mutton. There is no unanimity. The provinces have not agreed to this over-all concept.

A regrettable situation has developed across Canada inasmuch as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) promised the nation that cattle would be excepted. It was found that his word was completely discredited since cattle were still covered by the bill. On September 9 a federal-provincial conference took place in Ottawa. The Premiers came out of that conference saying: From what we know of Bill C-197 at this time, we accept it and pass it. It may be the answer to the chicken and eggs war. But this agreement hinged on cattle being excluded from the bill.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Many Members of Parliament think the Minister of Agriculture has reneged on his undertaking to the cattlemen, that he has somehow misled the Canadian Cattlemen's Association. But he did not mislead the Canadian cattlemen alone; he misled the provincial Premiers. If

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

one wants evidence of this one can find it at page 18 of committee proceedings No. 7 for December 15, when the Minister of Agriculture outlined what was in the communiqué issued by the federal-provincial conference held in Ottawa, at which the Premiers and the Prime Minister urged passage of the legislation provided provisions relating to cattle and calves were eliminated.

In Winnipeg the Prime Minister acknowledged the fact that in order to meet the difficulty of divided jurisdiction in the area of marketing agricultural produce, the government would undertake to discuss with the provinces the possibility of providing an over-all authority for agricultural products under federal jurisdiction. In other words, the federal government would take unto itself more power. Although there is a certain jealousy in Canadian society today among the provinces with regard to central government authority, on this occasion the provinces agreed to accept the Prime Minister's suggestion.

This acceptance was contingent upon the statement made on September 16 that cattle and calves would be excluded. This was the condition upon which the provinces agreed to early passage of the bill. However, today, six months after that statement was made on September 16, the provisions relating to cattle and calves are still in the bill. As a result, I say that the agreement reached between the provinces and the government is null and void. The only conclusion I can reach is that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture have no agreement at all with the provinces. Mr. Speaker, this situation vividly illustrates why the bill should not be proceeded with until it is ascertained whether agreement has been reached.

It may be argued that some provinces agree with the bill while others do not. It may also be argued that Members of Parliament are misrepresenting the facts. What are the facts regarding the agreement of the provinces and the jurisdictional question? This marketing legislation has been referred to the Supreme Court of Canada by the province of Manitoba. If the government of Manitoba were in favour of this bill and wanted early passage, why would it refer the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada? At least seven of the ten provinces have informed the Supreme Court that they would be prepared to submit evidence to the court and to brief counsel. Unfortunately, owing to pressure of business the Supreme Court cannot hear the case until May 31, which is about one month away.

What has been happening in the meantime? There has been an escalation of the war between the "countries"—the provinces. Members may laugh at that statement, but I remember one of the greatest exponents of this bill in the Liberal party saying that Canada is not one country but ten countries under one nation. To me that is a terrible admission to make. I still hold out a ray of hope that in essence Canada is one country, that we are not building fences around our provinces.

Mr. Mahoney: Who said that?

Mr. Horner: The hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle) said that. I have before me an advertise-