

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I remind hon. members that we are on second reading and not in committee, and if this type of questioning continues we shall not get very far. I ask all hon. members to co-operate with the Chair.

**Mr. Horner:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I assure Your Honour that it is my wholehearted desire to co-operate fully with the Chair. The minister has said that the bill states that the majority of producers must request the establishment of a marketing agency. I say that is not in the bill, and I say the minister is misleading the House if he says it is and if he cannot disclose to the House what part of what clause of the bill says that. If it is in the bill, let the minister disclose what clause it is in.

**Mr. Thompson:** The minister should read the bill.

**Mr. Horner:** If he cannot disclose it, he should withdraw those remarks which go to the root of this debate.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, I am not misleading the House and I do not accept responsibility for the way the hon. member has interpreted my remarks.

**Mr. Bigg:** But where does it say that in the bill?

**Mr. Olson:** I have said that no national marketing agency can be established without the majority support of the producers.

**Mr. Horner:** But it does not say that in the bill.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, if hon. members will not listen to the rest of the argument they can never be informed about the bill.

**Mr. Horner:** I am listening.

**Mr. Olson:** I want to explain to hon. members opposite that the federal government has not jurisdiction to set up, under a bill, a program of supply management on the production side. That is clear. That is within provincial jurisdiction and is provided for in existing provincial statutes. So far as I can determine, the provincial statutes provide that only after a majority vote—and in some cases the question must be carried by a great deal more than a bare majority—in a plebiscite on the part of producers can this program be set up. Of course, one follows the other. I have acknowledged that it has proven difficult over the years to make advances in

marketing legislation. The provincial governments acknowledge that. We have an opportunity now, with the support of most of the major farm organizations and indeed all of the provinces, to make a significant advance through the passage of this bill through the House.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I am prepared to work with the House and the committee to improve this bill. I wish to indicate now that some amendments which are being considered will help clarify some of the points raised by hon. members opposite. I hope all members of the House will be prepared to work positively and in the interests of the agricultural industry so that we can get this bill to committee, where there can be given detailed explanations of what is in provincial legislation, to satisfy the members of the committee that what is in Bill C-197 is complementary to that legislation and does not exceed the jurisdictional authority of the federal government. We also wish to satisfy the committee that the people who have had a great deal of experience in marketing legislation, namely, the provincial governments, find the wording and the provisions of this bill satisfactory.

I acknowledge that a number of provisions of this bill are perhaps severe if the most severe interpretation is put on them. There is no question about that in my mind. However, if it performs the function for which it was designed, it must be similar to legislation now on the provincial statute books, the same legislation that we intend this bill to co-ordinate. I hope all hon. members will co-operate with us. I can assure hon. members that thousands of farmers across the country are waiting for this kind of bill to be included in the federal statutes. This also applies to the provincial governments. We must, therefore, get on with the job of co-ordinating the efforts of the producers and the provincial governments.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister a question? In view of the fact that the minister has admitted that the bill is defective, by indicating that clarifying amendments will be introduced, why does the minister not withdraw the bill until he has the amendments, so that we will know what we are going to do?

**Mr. Olson:** As the hon. member knows, second reading is for the purpose of accepting or rejecting the principle of the bill. That is what we are discussing. The hon. member