

The exclusion of cattle and veal would take away from Quebec one of Quebec's main negotiating tools in the eventual distribution of product quotas, because Quebec is in a shortage position in this particular area.

Quebec cannot give such marketing agencies any authority unless there is control of production.

Time and time again I have heard the minister say there is no control of production in this bill. Everybody knows it except the minister. The Minister of Agriculture for Quebec also said:

If you are going to sell in Quebec, then you will produce—or offer for sale—according to Quebec's dictates.

Quebec's main negotiating tool is the distribution of production quotas.

• (3:00 a.m.)

On the other side of the coin we can ask this question, Why do those engaged in the cattle industry want to be excluded from the provisions of this bill. I am sure that many members on the other side of the House do not know why the cattlemen want to be excluded from the bill. They do not know how great a percentage the cattlemen and calf breeders are of our agricultural industry. Traditionally, cattlemen have opposed the philosophy and principle of controlled marketing and production quotas. Ever since they have been organized they have opposed that principle.

Many people are not aware that the cattle industry represents almost a quarter of the total farm production of Canada. It is the single, most important facet of Canadian agriculture. The beef producing industry is, by a substantial margin, the largest single segment of the Canadian agricultural economy and surpasses both the wheat and dairy product parts of that economy. The Canadian beef industry is completely free of special subsidies, and in the present troubled agricultural economy suffers fewer problems than most other sectors of the industry.

In view of the successful record of the cattle industry, one questions the motives of this government in attempting to control this industry. Those are the two sides of the coin. This bill is before the House now because of the dictates of the government of Quebec which have influenced our Minister of Agriculture. That minister is trying to impose this bill on a segment of agriculture that has never needed it and does not want it. I say that this will be a major step towards socializing the whole industry. Accordingly, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey):

That Bill C-176, an act to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, be not now read a third time but be referred back to the Standing Committee on Agriculture with an instruction to amend paragraph (c) of clause 2 of the said bill by adding thereto, immediately following the word 'product' at the end thereof, the words 'but, for the purpose of any of the provisions of this act, shall not include cattle or calves.'

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I say with respect to the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) that there is now an amendment before the House, and unless hon. members can convince the Chair that we should receive another amendment I feel that we cannot receive this amendment. I recognize the Parlia-

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

mentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Mahoney).

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, my objection is probably superfluous now. I was wondering if it would not be desirable for the hon. member seconding the motion to be in the House when the motion is proposed.

Mr. Forrestall: Come off it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As I indicated, there is an amendment before the House in the name of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). It is seconded by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard). The House is considering that amendment, and until it is disposed of I suggest we cannot deal with another amendment.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I say as emphatically as I can that I cannot support the bill and will vote against it on third reading. The hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth) cited a number of reasons why I and other members of my party cannot support the bill. I concur wholeheartedly with his remarks and do not intend to repeat what many have said this evening.

I want to elaborate on one or two points dealing with the bill to which I took particular exception. I object particularly to a point, consistently made throughout this debate, to the effect that the bill will help stimulate small farm enterprises. That was just a lot of garble from the other side of the House. Hon. members opposite tried to leave the impression that this bill will be the salvation of the small family farm.

I am disappointed because hon. members opposite failed to accept one or two amendments that we proposed this evening. One amendment, if accepted, would make sure that the council would be dedicated to the preservation and enhancement of the economic and social viability of the family farm and the farm community. To the extent that this government has supposedly focused its efforts on helping the small family farm unit, one would think that hon. members opposite would welcome our amendment. For if this bill represents indeed their new approach and outlook on the subject of farm policy, the amendment would certainly be consistent with their over-all approach.

There has been developing for the past few years a situation which in my opinion is most undesirable. A trend is developing in this country which is resulting in the depopulation of rural areas. This affects not only those who are engaged in farming but also, and equally, the rural farm communities which depend largely on surrounding areas for support. Many say that present developments are inevitable, that they are the product of our times and life-style and are a form of progress. To my mind, this development represents a retrograde step in the development of Canadian society and a retrograde step in the development of the kind of life that Canadians want, be they in urban or rural Canada.

I say that, firstly, because many in this country still are desirous of maintaining and sustaining a healthy and viable life in a rural community. They want to live in a rural community. However, many programs and policies which have been developed have deprived many people of that privilege. We are still experiencing a mass exodus of people from the country to the city. This is adding to the