

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

It continues:

Economically, this system is likely to be a disaster. Balkanizing the economy into ten sub-economies and preventing the shift of production to those areas in which it can be carried out most cheaply and most profitably.

This is a very interesting statement. This is exactly what the bill is doing: it will balkanize the country and create regions and barriers within the country. It is interesting to note what the newspapers have to say. Here is an item which appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press Weekly* of February 13. The headline reads: "C-176 not for producers". Here is another in the *Western Producer* of February 11: "Western groups list objections to national marketing bill terms". The article lists the number of people who are opposed. The *Manitoba Co-operator* states that Bill C-176 in its present form is a document that could perpetuate and accentuate regional differences and destroy the basic economy of Manitoba. What did the minister say at Purdue University, Indiana? I have here an editorial which appeared in the *Country Guide* for April, 1971. It reads as follows:

Federal agricultural minister H. A. "Bud" Olson, speaking at a meeting at Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.: "Reduced to its simplest terms, the legislation would allow provincial marketing agencies to delegate their powers to a national agency. By the same token, the federal government could delegate its authority, including the power to control trade between provinces, to the national agency.

Is the province of Quebec prepared to delegate its power to a national agency? Is Bill Stewart, the Minister of Agriculture, prepared to delegate his power to a national agency over which he has no control? I doubt it very much. Today we see the provinces trying to protect that which is theirs. The national government, under this power-hungry Prime Minister, is seeking more and more power: the Minister of Agriculture admits it in this article.

Is the federal government really delegating its power to a national agency? It is not. It is appointing the national agency, so, actually the agency is part and parcel of the federal government. Therefore, the federal government really is not delegating its power, but the provincial governments will be delegating their power. If in June the Supreme Court should uphold the Manitoba case to the effect that there shall be free trade in Canada and that no province can interfere with it, there will not be one province which will agree with this bill. Why should they? Their trade would then move and no one could interfere with it. I say this bill should be held up and not debated until we know exactly the situation in respect of interprovincial trade. The hon. member for Fraser Valley East had something to say about this as recorded in the *Canadian Poultryman* for January, 1971. He said:

The government presented a poorly-drafted bill.

Never was a truer word spoken by the hon. member for Fraser Valley East. The article continues:

The producers have succeeded in preventing more comprehensive amendments.

The matter is being discussed in the courts and by people all across Canada. It is being discussed by the

[Mr. Horner.]

apple growers in British Columbia and by the apple growers in Nova Scotia. The bill should be held up until the whole question is settled. I have endeavoured to understand the government persistence. As I said earlier, the only rationalization I can find for the government's persistence in this regard is that it wants power: power is the only thing the Prime Minister and the government want. He is now a full member of the Liberal party as he saw it in 1963—power-hungry, reaching out for more power and taking power from the provinces through this legislation under the guise that he will then regulate everything. It is something like a farmer telling his son, "I will give you no money. Leave all the money with me and I will dole it out wisely." This never satisfies the son. When the provinces really understand this legislation they will not be satisfied with it either.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, welcome this opportunity to comment on Bill C-176, particularly on the first amendment that has been moved following its return to the House from the standing committee. However, I am in a bit of a quandary because it seems to me there were assertions made about motives and that sort of things respecting certain witnesses, and indeed certain hon. members, in connection with things which it is suggested took place during the committee hearings.

I am not sure whether it is appropriate for members of the House to reflect on what has taken place in committee, particularly in that respect, because if this is to be a practice that is undertaken by some committees I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you would agree it is open to all members of the House to take the same position with respect to that kind of procedure. I am not raising a point of order about it now, but I take it from the comments made that we will probably get into that situation and I think it will be regrettable if we do.

Mr. Horner: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the committee proceedings, the committee studied a bill and its proceedings then became available to all members of the House. Many hon. members may have wished to take part in the debate in the committee but were not able to do so because of prior allotment of their time to other committees. Therefore it behooves me to suggest that what the minister is saying would disallow discussion on what took place in the committee. Surely it is the duty of committee members to enlighten all members of the House on what went on in the committee and the arguments raised in the committee.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has completely missed the point. I think it is one of the long-standing rules of the House that no member may reflect on the vote or indeed on the motives of any other hon. member, whether the member was voting in the House or in committee. But in any event I am not going to raise a fuss—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret interrupting the minister, and I know he did not raise this as a