

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

our country. The Manitoba producers kept their sights clear on the same issue and on the pitfalls in this bill. Thank goodness they had the good sense to develop a test case which received a history-making ruling from the Supreme Court of Canada earlier this year, I believe on June 28. I would recommend the various contributions by legal counsel given before the court in that case as valuable reading for members of the Liberal party.

• (5:50 p.m.)

The Progressive Conservative party believes in policies which encourage aggressive, imaginative marketing. Therefore, we support the establishment of marketing boards which give all producers—and all I repeat, all producers—fair access to markets. However, we do not think that Bill C-176 in its present form will do this. We believe the law should set the environment for the marketing of farm products and that such legal framework is acceptable and is the guarantor of the national interest. However, this bill would take the legal framework for the marketing of farm products out of the public arena, beyond the discipline of the BNA Act and the judiciary, and place the rule-making in the hands of bureaucrats and vested interests who essentially will be defensive regarding their own interests in the industry. In other words, this bill in its present form is constructed in such a way that it can lead to severe balkanization.

The amendments we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker, are concerned specifically with the cattle industry. I would point out that the cattle industry makes up about 25 per cent of the total agricultural industry of Canada. Here are some of the pertinent questions that cattlemen pose:

1. Where in the bill is there an inescapable assurance that a nationwide vote open to all producers of a commodity must, not may, be held before the establishment of a national marketing agency for that commodity?

2. Where in the bill are there clearly stated rights of appeal to persons who believe themselves to be aggrieved by the bill?

3. How will the farm products marketing council become "satisfied" that a majority of producers is in favour of the establishment of an agency?

4. How will Bill C-176, if passed, solve the chicken and egg war? Or how will it solve similar incidents in the future?

5. How will provincial quotas for beef be determined if an agency is established?

6. How will Bill C-176 effect improved beef prices if an agency is established?

7. How will Bill C-176 improve prices if importations of like products from the United States and low cost countries are not controlled?

8. What economic research has been conducted to establish that supply management or any of the other provisions of Bill C-176 will prove of benefit to the beef industry?

9. What will the agency and the administrative structure necessary to carry out the intent of Bill C-176 in the beef industry cost, and who will bear that cost?

10. If an agency is established for beef, will interprovincial movement be subject to controls? If not, how will the bill operate?

[Mr. Southam.]

11. Does an Ontario beef producer have a greater right to the Ontario market for beef than a beef producer in Alberta?

12. Why attempt passage of the bill when a Supreme Court ruling on the constitutionality of restrictions to interprovincial movement is imminent?

That question is not pertinent now because I have just referred to the Supreme Court ruling that was handed down.

13. What problems in the beef production and marketing sphere exist now, or are likely to exist in the foreseeable future, that may be resolved by the application of provisions in Bill C-176?

14. Did beef producers seek this bill, and do they now want it applied to their industry? Do individuals or groups have a right to oppose or resist the imposition of legislation upon them when this legislation cannot be demonstrated to be essential to the public interest? Does the government have the right to impose legislation under these conditions?

15. What are the full definitions of "enabling legislation" and of "permissive legislation"?

16. Since the members of the council are deemed to be public servants, are they required to carry out the instructions of the minister or to function in a manner consistent with government policy?

These are very pertinent questions and I believe that similar ones could be asked by other sectors of the agricultural industry. Yesterday I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton when he criticized my colleague, the hon. member for Crowfoot, who introduced these amendments. I listened when he was imputing motives and I was disgusted that a man of the cloth, a man of his position, taking a seat in this House, would make statements that were so far from the truth.

I hold in my hand the front page of a newspaper which in effect consolidates three newspapers, the *Carnduff Gazette Post-News*, the issue of May 20, 1971, which has a headline reading, "Stockmen strongly opposed to proposed C-176 marketing bill." I wish to quote from it in order to indicate that it is not just one or two big operators in the stock industry who are opposed to this bill. The report in the newspaper reads in part:

Stock growers, 200 strong from southeastern Saskatchewan, at Alameda on Friday evening, severely criticized the federal government for its efforts to include beef in particular—and pork—in the controversial marketing bill, C-176.

Twenty-nine points were represented at the meeting: Alameda, Arcola, Antler, Alida, Bienfait, Bellegarde, Big Beaver, Brownlee, Carnduff, Carlyle, Carievale, Estevan, Frobisher, Gainsborough, Glen Ewen, Kisbey, Kennedy, Lampman, Manor, Maryfield, Maple Creek, Northgate, North Portal, Portal, N.D., Oxbow, Redvers, Steelman, Weyburn, Willmar, and Yellow Grass.

This covers a wide area of southeastern Saskatchewan in which stockmen, not big ranchers but people who produce top calibre beef, have registered their strong opposition to this bill. I quote this passage for the benefit of the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton because obviously he did not know what he was talking about yesterday. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association presented a brief to the Standing Committee on Agriculture in connection with