

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

posed of separately. At this stage any outstanding deferred division might be taken.

Motions Nos. 13, 14, 15 and 16 all relate to clause 7 of the bill. It is suggested that those motions be grouped for the purpose of debate, but that each question be put separately. Deferred divisions on the foregoing, if any, might be taken at that time. Motions Nos. 17 and 18, which are on clause 8 of the bill, should be grouped for debate but voted upon separately. Motions Nos. 19 and 20 might be debated and voted upon separately. At this stage, any outstanding deferred division might be taken before proceeding to part II of the bill.

It is suggested that motions Nos. 21, 22 and 23 be debated and disposed of separately. It is suggested that motions Nos. 24, 25 and 26 be grouped for the purpose of debate, but the question on each be put separately. At this stage, it might be desirable to take any outstanding deferred divisions. It is suggested that motion No. 27 be debated and disposed of separately. It is also suggested that motions Nos. 28 and 29 be grouped for the purpose of debate, but the question be put on each separately.

As suggested earlier, motion No. 30 might not be acceptable in that it purports to amend the Export and Import Permits Act and it would appear to be irrelevant to Bill C-176. It might be desirable to hear representations when motion No. 30 is reached. After motion No. 30 is disposed of, any outstanding deferred division may be taken to complete the report stage.

If hon. members are in agreement, the Chair will call motion No. 1. We can then proceed in the time remaining this evening. Hon. members might give some thought to the memorandum I have just read into the record.

The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) moves amendment No. 1 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 from subclause (c) of clause 2 all the words after the word "agriculture" at line 14, page 1.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** May I make one suggestion at this stage, now that Your Honour has read the reasons for the groupings? I had a chance to discuss and consider these groupings earlier; I did not have a chance to complete my consideration. The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) has indicated what might be a reasonable ground for urging the Chair to review the grouping including motion No. 1. There are two other motions in his name which have the same principle at stake as motion No. 1.

As Your Honour has called motion No. 1, in view of the argument made by the hon. member for Crowfoot would it be fair at this stage to say that the hon. member for Crowfoot will not be precluded from making his argument until there is an opportunity for the Chair to further consider the representations made by the hon. member? The hon. member for Crowfoot might be free to at least address his remarks to the grouping which he has urged upon the Chair as being reasonable. The Chair

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

would then have an opportunity to read his remarks. Acknowledging that Your Honour has complete discretion to accept the remarks of the hon. member for Crowfoot, it may be that tomorrow Your Honour could make an adjustment on this one particular grouping.

● (9:40 p.m.)

I urge this now in order that my hon. friend from Crowfoot will not be restricted as he otherwise might be in the remarks he has to make dealing with the first motion.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Unless hon. members have objections to raise, the Chair feels that the hon. member for Crowfoot should be allowed to make his observations at this point on the basis of the procedural argument he put forward earlier, and all hon. members will have a chance to read it by tomorrow.

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising in to debate what has now become a very famous bill, Bill C-176 I intend to speak on the concept of its basic principles. As I understand it, this is basically enabling legislation or, at the utmost, permissive legislation. Nobody will be involved unless he wishes to be. This is enabling legislation which will encompass no part of the agricultural industry unless it really wants to be encompassed.

It is necessary when considering this question to possess some concept of British justice or British tradition, a tradition inherited by our system in Canada, by virtue of which we are innocent until proven guilty. All kinds of latitude are given to an individual to govern himself or his property until the law says that certain things cannot be done. In essence, everything can be done unless the law forbids it. The bill before us has to do with agricultural products, but whether or not it will directly affect any particular agricultural product will depend solely on the producers of those products. To understand this concept perfectly, of course, I suppose one has to be a lawyer. I am not a lawyer but somehow or other, through seepage or through a process of osmosis in this House of Commons, these notions filter through.

Where did the concept of the bill before us originate, and why is this legislation being brought forward now? I think this can best be explained by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) himself by reference to a few curt remarks he made about the Liberal party in 1963. He said then that the Liberal party was a party madly in search of power and prepared to use power for the sake of power alone. I have the exact quotation here somewhere and will gladly read it when I find it. In any case, I should like to read from the Prime Minister's remarks with regard to agricultural policy and marketing arrangements made in a speech in Winnipeg on June 2, 1968. It just so happens it was prior to an election. He had this to say about national marketing boards:

More and more farmers are turning to marketing boards to provide them with a vehicle for the orderly marketing of their products. Existing boards established under provincial authority are finding it increasingly difficult to operate due to altered conditions brought on largely through changes in the techno-