

**Mr. Rose:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the advice offered by the Chair. I can only say that since amendment No. 1, with which we are currently dealing, and two others before us cover such a wide range of topics, including the exclusion of virtually every agricultural commodity from the aegis of the bill, and in view of the wide-ranging debate indulged in by the two previous speakers, I believe some latitude is possible. But I will attempt to follow your instructions and deal as closely as I can with the motion before us.

By the passage of this bill the government had hoped to avoid doing what Manitoba did, challenge the validity of provincial import orders in the Supreme Court. The federal government took what I think is regarded as the easy way out to avoid the political flack likely to come from extremely sensitive states righters in certain provinces. But it seems to me, in considering this motion tonight, that whatever the government's motives were, they are not really relevant at this point. The Supreme Court of Canada has reasserted the proposition that freely-moving provincial trade is the price of our confederation and has done what our federal government has been reluctant to assert. I think, however, that I should remind hon. members that even with the passage of this bill as it stands, or as amended, our problems will still be a long way from being over.

**Mr. Horner:** Would the hon. member allow a question?

**Mr. Rose:** Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Crowfoot asked whether the hon. member would permit a question. Of course, this is up to the hon. member who has the floor.

**Mr. Rose:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is a personal friend of mine, but I have only 20 minutes in which to make my remarks. Therefore I would be very pleased, if there is any time at the conclusion, to answer any question the hon. member would care to put to me.

**Mr. Horner:** That is acceptable to me.

**Mr. Rose:** There seems to be some impression, perhaps emanating from the government benches, that Bill C-176 is going to solve forever most or all of the problems facing Canadian agriculture. This is far from being the case. On May 10 I directed the following question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), as recorded at page 5636 of *Hansard*:

The Prime Minister has suggested to us that the passage of Bill C-176 might avoid certain constitutional problems in regard to import orders and free trade across Canada, and hopefully it will. But does the Prime Minister not agree that should some provinces or any province decide to opt out of the bill the government will still face the constitutional problem if the province that opts out insists in shipping its product into the common market area?

After a while the Prime Minister replied:

—am inclined to agree that there will be difficulties even after Bill C-176 has been adopted if we do not get the co-operation of

24171—53½

### *Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

the provinces in the implementation thereof. However, this is not new.

He went on to talk about the Rowell-Sirois commission and added:

Now, after some 30 years, the federal government has come up with a bill that tries to solve the problem by way of co-operation with the provinces and I am rather distressed that the opposition will not even permit us to try that course.

This is extremely serious, Mr. Speaker. We have now to rationalize both the decision rendered by the Supreme Court of Canada along with the Prime Minister's suggestion that if one or more provinces decide to opt out of the marketing agencies, then that province or provinces could continue to assert their provincial rights under section 91 of the BNA Act and ship products into the regulated marketing area and thus threaten the whole business of Bill C-176 with collapse.

● (8:50 p.m.)

I repeat, it is a very serious thing we are facing. We are a long way from being out of the woods, and the possibility of some provinces opting out and others losing traditional Canadian markets is a terrifying prospect. Members of the agricultural committee have worked very hard on this bill for months and have made two coast to coast tours in order to get it to the present stage. After spending all this time and trouble studying hundreds of briefs, it is presumed that even the dullest among us have gathered some impressions and learned something about it.

I have the distinct impression that it is the fear of Prairie Canada that, subsidized by the feed freight assistance act, the central and Maritime provinces will move to self-sufficiency as quickly as possible in at least eggs, poultry, hogs and possibly beef to serve the adjacent huge centres of population of Toronto and Montreal. As a result, the better comparative cost areas of the west which produce this grain would be rapidly frozen out of their traditional markets. This is behind a good deal of the opposition to this bill. This is the fear and concern. The feeling in Prairie Canada might be expressed in a sentence.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The Chair feels it should be fair in this matter. I interrupted the hon. member for Fraser Valley East and the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek twice. I think, with respect, that they were both out of order and I believe the hon. member who now has the floor is equally out of order. Therefore it would be only fair that I interrupt him twice and ask him respectfully to come back to order. The other two hon. members did not come back to order, but I would ask the hon. member for Fraser Valley West to do so. We must obey the Standing Orders and rules of the House.

**Mr. Rose:** Mr. Speaker, I know that some of us have tried your patience this evening, but what we are attempting to do in dealing with this amendment is put forward some of the arguments as to why there has been a certain regional reluctance to embrace the whole con-