

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

which does not already exist. Then he ends his statement by saying: "This, of course, is absolutely wrong".

Mr. Olson: That is right.

Mr. McIntosh: The minister's own statements are an indication that we are absolutely right. Let us see what he has to say about the livestock industry, with which he should be very concerned. The livestock industry has always strongly opposed the suggestion of livestock marketing boards. The minister, coming from a constituency that has a large amount of livestock producers, should be aware of this. I ask the minister, is it now the wish of the livestock producers to have a marketing board? The minister has said he acts on behalf of all producers, so may I refer to what he said as reported at page 6998 of *Hansard*:

I know, Mr. Speaker, that we could single out commodities. Let us take beef, for instance. At the present time there are no marketing boards involved in the marketing of beef... and there probably never will be as long as that industry is not in severe economic difficulty. If no province brings in that kind of legislation, then of course no part of Bill C-197 will ever be applied to the beef industry.

In view of that statement I ask the minister why the provision is in the bill. The words used by the minister are "probably never will be", not as long as he is minister—though we do not expect him to be minister for very long.

Mr. Olson: You might not get your wish.

Mr. McIntosh: I do not wish for anything for you. I am wishing for the livestock producers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would invite the hon. member to direct his remarks to the Chair. Perhaps fewer interjections will enable him to do that.

Mr. McIntosh: I ask the minister why clause 22 is in the bill, the clause that refers to production and marketing. Why is clause 17 in the bill? Clause 17 provides:

(1) The Governor in Council may by proclamation establish an agency with powers relating to any farm product or farm products the marketing of which in interprovincial and export trade is not regulated pursuant to the Canadian Wheat Board Act or the Canadian Dairy Commission Act.

(2) Every agency established pursuant to this act is a body corporate.

If these two provisions never will be applied, why are they in the bill? Clause 2 (e)

(v), which is also an interesting provision, reads as follows:

—a system for the licensing of persons engaged in the growing or production of the regulated product for, or the marketing thereof in, interprovincial or export trade, including provision for fees payable to the appropriate agency by any such person in respect of any licence issued to him and for the cancellation or suspension of any such licence where a term or condition thereof is not complied with—

If this provision were never used against the livestock producers, it would be funny indeed. The minister also said in his speech that the word is written and that if it becomes law, it will be the law and that all people will abide by it—including the livestock producers; let no mistake be made about that. The third statement of the minister to which I wish to refer is as follows:

I challenge hon. members opposite to find in Bill C-197 any power to control the actions of individuals which is not already to be found in the legislation of the provinces across Canada—

We accept that challenge. If we are proved right, then the minister should either resign or withdraw his bill. I refer the minister, or anyone else for that matter, to clause 22, which I have already read, dealing with the control of production and marketing, to clause 37 which provides for punishment for offences and for penalties, and to clause 34 dealing with the powers of inspectors. If I had more time I would go into that matter, too. That provision is unheard of in Canada. I suggest it is unheard of in any democratic society, being reserved for countries behind the iron curtain. Those are the minister's words relating to the livestock industry. I said that the minister has contradicted himself, and he has. That alone proves his statement to be wrong.

I have already referred to clause 2 (e) (v) which provides for licences and fees in regard to the growing and production of regulated products. I suggest that under the terms of this bill any person engaged in the industry of agriculture can be controlled. The bill can determine those who are to work in agriculture and those who will be removed. If in the view of the government young people should not take up farming, again this bill gives the federal government power so to provide. This is not what the producers want.

The minister also stated that the federal government has not jurisdiction to set up, under a bill, a program of supply management on the production side. He said it is clear that it is within provincial jurisdiction, that it is provided for in existing provincial