

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

pass in its present form. There is a provision in respect of the levying of licence fees, or charges, on farms as necessary to finance the agencies on a self-sustaining basis without appropriations from Parliament. Then there is a clause which states that any person who violates any provision of the act or regulations is guilty of an indictable offence. Mr. Speaker, the minister is a neighbour of mine. He is also a farmer and rancher: at least, he says he is and I believe he is. But let us look at these words "guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years". Here is an offence punishable by summary conviction.

Mr. Speaker, in the years the minister and I have been here we have heard many ayes and nays. But only tonight have I heard so many "I's" from the minister. I am disappointed that the minister said "I" so many times. Anyone familiar with the agricultural industry knows there is very little relationship between the existing provincial marketing agencies and the type of agencies proposed by this bill. Provincial marketing agencies are set up at the request of a majority of producers. The members of the boards in control of such agencies are elected by the primary producers. Perhaps I might go back for a moment and refer to what I said earlier. I stated that any person who violates any provision of this act or the regulations is guilty of an offence. The government, and the minister in particular, are not asking the producers any more. We talk about a just society!

An hon. Member: What is that?

Mr. Gundlock: It would seem to me to be rapidly turning into a controlled society. All we need do is look at the white paper, Information Canada or the CRTC. I can call myself a bona fide farmer because I am one. I think the minister is, too. I am amazed that the minister, who is a farmer and a rancher, would allow this type of legislation to be introduced. I wish to emphasize and repeat that a person who violates any provision of the act or regulations is guilty. He may be a farmer, a rancher or a businessman. If he does not comply with the government's regulations he is guilty. We in our party do not believe we are guilty. We believe we have a right to market something. If I have a product which I wish to market, I have a moral right to do so.

Mr. Speaker, through you I would ask the minister: If he had a cow that did not meas-

[Mr. Gundlock.]

ure up to the standards laid down, what would he do with it? If he had a chicken which did not measure up to the standards, what would he do with it? Would he just kill it, or would he try to market it? If he did, what would happen to him as a minister or as a farmer? I think we have gone too far, and when I say "we" I mean Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Gundlock: I sincerely suggest that the minister should pay attention to the advice of the committee and of his own members on that committee. Certainly he should pay attention to the advice of his conscience. Whether I raise a duck, grow grain, build a house or gravel a road, I am a basic producer. We come right back to the same thing when we are basic producers and do not agree with the government and with this piece of legislation—we violate all the provisions of this bill. In other words, we cannot sell the produce of our labour any more. We have to ask the government, "What are we going to do? What will happen to us?" What is left for us? It is an indictable offence and we are liable to imprisonment.

I am a bona fide farmer and have been a Member of Parliament for several years. As a matter of fact, I am a neighbour of the minister and I am surprised that he should condone such legislation. I welcome an explanation from the minister at this point. This bill provides for an offence punishable on summary conviction. As a Canadian, as a farmer and as a Member of Parliament, I cannot understand the minister and I cannot go along with this legislation.

As I said earlier, this is not a just society but a controlled society, and I think the minister is controlled by the society in which we are supposed to live. This bill spells it out loudly and clearly. The minister goes along with it. The first time I ever rose on a point of order in this House I heard many yeas and many nays, but I have never before heard the minister say so often, in such a short time, that he is for the bill.

He says he goes along with the bill. I think he will have to live with it and so will the government. But I cannot imagine why the government should want to bring forth a piece of legislation such as this. We are talking about a bill on agriculture. Anyone who is a primary producer, whether he be a farmer, a fisherman or a bricklayer, if he cannot sell his produce, whether it be from the land, the