

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

An hon. Member: Who are they?

Mr. McIntosh: They are part of the agricultural industry, if you fellows from the east do not understand. These people were badly fooled, and they know it. The executive of the Cattlemen's Association—the people affected by this bill in western Canada—informed the government that they were unanimously opposed to the inclusion of livestock in the bill. They were then given the assurance by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), both verbally and in writing, that cattle and calves would be excluded from the bill. But what has happened under this participatory democracy? The minister has reneged on his promise. It is the intended order of the government that cattle and calves be subject to the conditions of the bill. I am sorry that we are not on clause 2 because I would have more to say on this issue. Is it any wonder that the cattlemen are now asking: What does participatory democracy mean?

My colleague, the hon. member for Crowfoot, asked in his speech as recorded in *Hansard* at page 5294, on April 27: Where did the concept of this bill originate and why is the legislation being brought down now? The hon. member contends that a review of the Minister's statements during the past several years contains the answer. He referred to the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he addressed the Liberal party in 1963. He is reported to have said the following:

Power is what they are interested in. The only kick allowed is that which comes from a donkey.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I wonder if the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) and the hon. member for Duvernay (Mr. Kierans) felt that kick.

Say anything you like but put us in power because we are best suited to govern.

The hon. member for Crowfoot further supported his contention that the original concept of this bill was in the Prime Minister's mind when he spoke in Winnipeg on June 2, 1968. I quote the hon. member for Crowfoot as follows:

One can clearly see that as early as June 2, 1968, the government was fully prepared to bring in legislation such as Bill C-176, or C-197, as it was called in the first instance.

The hon. member for Battle River also contends that the thought behind the bill originated with the Prime Minister. He contends that the bill was not proposed by anyone with an agricultural background. He had some unkind but descriptive words to say about the Prime Minister and his speech of June 2, 1968, which he quoted in part as follows:

In order to meet the difficulties of divided jurisdiction in the area of marketing of agricultural products the government would undertake to raise for discussion with the provinces the possibility of providing over-all authority for the marketing of agricultural products as a federal responsibility.

He want on further to say—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I must do so to advise him that his time has expired.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Mr. Horner: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Of course, the hon. member may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

[Translation]

Mr. Roy (Laval): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I object to the hon. member continuing his statement, because he never attended any meeting of the Committee on Agriculture.

[English]

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, all last evening I wondered why the government, and particularly the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), were so anxious and determined to reserve time in the dying hours of this part of the session to debate the very controversial legislation contained in Bill C-176. Apparently the government went as far as to sweep aside the Judges Act, for which apparently there was agreement that it be proceeded with tonight. Apparently Bill C-176 is such a high priority item that they were prepared to push aside an earlier agreement with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and allow his bill to languish.

In view of the huge number of amendments to be considered, the Minister of Agriculture can scarcely expect the legislation to be put through this evening, particularly because of the heat the bill has created among some agricultural groups in Canada, notably the cowboys. It would appear that there are rather large political stakes being played with this bill. Since yesterday's Supreme Court decision, poultry and egg producers now face a very serious crisis because of the declared illegality of import orders assumed by at least four provinces.

I have said that I wondered why the government sought to debate Bill C-176 this evening, and I still do not know unless it is to give the illusion of action, to indicate to the general public that the government has not forgotten the bill entirely. The whole purpose behind the bill was a government attempt to avoid a constitutional confrontation over the free—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think it is incumbent on the Chair to remind the hon. member, as I reminded the hon. member for Fraser Valley East and the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek, that we should confine debate to the motions before the House. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre raised this point, and I agree with him. If hon. members do not want to do this, the Chair cannot enforce it. But I ask the hon. member, as I asked the two hon. members who preceded him, to observe the Standing Orders of the House applicable at report stage and deal with the motions before us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!