

There is no unanimity among the provinces in respect of this legislation, yet this government intends to proceed with it at a time when the department of information is sponsoring literature which suggests that Canada and Canadians must stand together and understand together. Can the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) honestly say they understand the position of Manitoba, when that province has to go to the Supreme Court of Canada for understanding and justice? The article to which I have referred suggests that we cannot bring Canada together by building fences around regions. I suggest that Bill C-176 allows for the building of fences around certain regions. My amendments Nos. 1, 5 and 22 would help tear down the fences this bill will allow to be constructed.

Some may say that I am misrepresenting the facts and that there will be no fences. They may suggest this is all in my imagination. Let me read what the deputy minister said about fences being built, as reported in committee proceedings No. 39, page 45 as follows:

I think if one changed it to the conditional what you are saying, sir, is perfectly correct; it could be. I do think of necessity that it will be. When I say that, if the Governor in Council wishes to extend that power to them, an agency can have authority to exercise control over products moving from an unregulated area into a regulated area.

He went on to say:

"We are not going to allow you to expand the movement into our market on an unlimited base." Probably what they would say to them would be something that might be similar to our GATT arrangements—

The Deputy Minister of Agriculture suggested to the Committee on Agriculture that the regions of Canada might require trade agreements similar to GATT. If that is the case we can hardly say this is one country. The hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle) said in this House and across the country that Canada is actually composed of 10 countries under one nation. If that is true we can look forward to very difficult times. If we have any intention of remaining united we will find ourselves in difficulty as a result of measures of this kind. This is what Mr. Uskiw, Minister of Agriculture for Manitoba, had to say on this point: it is to be found at page 26 of proceedings No. 17:

Let me say, as I mentioned earlier, that we did have discussions with the minister from Quebec. To what extent the trade has been involved with their counterparts in eastern Canada I do not know. That is another vehicle. However, again may I point out to you that I am not at all happy about accepting the principle of having to negotiate one's way into a Canadian market.

● (4:00 p.m.)

I suggest he does not have much hope. If we are one country we should be able to move freely between the various regions. We should be able to take our cattle and our money freely between the various regions and to move our produce freely between them, if this is one country. This bill will compound the problem of unity within our country. It is interesting to note that the question is before the Supreme Court. This debate should not proceed until the Supreme Court has ruled on whether we are one country or ten countries as the hon.

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

member suggests. As recorded at page 134 of committee proceedings No. 43, the minister had this to say on the subject:

It could be if it was moving into an area that was regulated.

The minister was answering a question I had asked as to whether the movement of products would be affected when being moved into another area for export. After the minister replied I said, "Yes, it may be affected". Then the minister said, "Yes". The transcript continues:

Mr. Horner: In other words then it may not be all that permissive.

Mr. Olson: Well it is permissive to the extent that I have explained previously.

Mr. Horner: Yes, to the extent that you have explained previously, but not completely permissive. If a province does not want to go in, it may well be affected by others going in.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, quite obviously if a number of provinces agreed to a national marketing plan to regulate the product within that region that some other region could not be expected to have complete free access to that market outside of the marketing agency.

In other words, he admits that if an agency is set up to encompass a portion of Canada, then the produce from the unregulated area cannot move into another area. This immediately sets up regions within Canada. As recorded at page 67 of committee proceedings No. 35, in answer to a question put by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) who was pursuing a certain line of questioning the minister said:

Mr. Chairman, the provisions for what Mr. Mazankowski has raised are provided in clause 18 which is, indeed, the contents of the proclamation establishing an agency and giving that agency the powers by an act of the Governor in Council. Of course, if every province in Canada wants an iron-clad guarantee that they can opt out of the plan if a plan is in effect and still sell all of their products into any other part of Canada without any obstruction at all is the position that they would be in in the event that no province had any marketing legislation. We know that the situation is that the provinces have and some of them are exercising their authority very severely now.

He is quite correct. The report continues:

Mr. Mazankowski: Is it constitutional, though?

Mr. Olson: Of course, that is an argument that the courts will decide.

He immediately admits that the courts must decide this question. Why are we occupying time in the agricultural committee and in this House on a matter which will be decided by the courts? I understand the arguments have to be filed by May 21. We should not be proceeding with this matter. We all know there has been a great deal of debate on this bill. What does the report of the agricultural task force say about this? This passage appears at page 320:

One possible kind of national marketing board is a national producer-controlled agency created by provincial marketing boards.

This is exactly what this bill attempts to do. The report goes on to give an explanation of how it might work:

A formula might be devised to share expansion in each provincial market, perhaps according to growth in population or to give greater self-sufficiency provincially.