

agencies will integrate and as they have to resort to the federal legislation the marketing problem in Canada will fade away.

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It would appear we are now entering into a debate between the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) and the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Côté). I might say that the time allotted to the hon. member for Richelieu has now expired.

**Mr. Downey:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I realize the time of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Côté) has expired, but there is one question we should clear up, in light of the discussion we have heard between the two hon. members on the subject of the family farm. If I might pose a further question to the hon. member for Richelieu—

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Stanbury:** What kind of question of privilege is that?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** As I have indicated, the time of the hon. member for Richelieu has expired. The Chair is, of course, in the hands of hon. members and if they wish to extend the time available to the hon. member they can do so. Is that agreeable?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Downey:** I note that according to the figures, about 80 per cent of the broiler industry in Quebec is controlled by four outfits—three feed companies and an organization headed by a man called Benoit Beauregard. Was the hon. member referring to the family farms which control 80 per cent of industry in Quebec, namely, the four I have mentioned? I should also like to ask the hon. member this question: Is he, or is he not, a tool of the integrators?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The Chair asked hon. members if they wished to extend the time of the hon. member for Richelieu so that he might accept a question from the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey). With respect, the hon. member for Battle River should have asked a question rather than entered into debate with the hon. member. The hon. member for Richelieu might wish to answer the first question, but with respect to the second part it seemed to the Chair that it was not a proper question.

[Translation]

**Mr. Côté (Richelieu):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that I must abide by your decision that the second question should not be answered. However, I wish I could have answered it.

As for the first question about the family farm, it was not raised by myself but by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). Besides, I had explained myself the gradual elimination of small producers, and a phenomenon which is of concern to him. In fact, on Quebec farms, there remain very few broiler producers. The lack of a national legislation accounts for the breaking up of the family farm and the taking over of big producers. The family farm producers were unable to put up with the ups and downs of production.

#### *Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

The small producers who were unable to support production costs were automatically absorbed by the big producers. The purpose of the bill now under study is to prevent such things in the future.

• (9:50 p.m.)

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It does seem to the Chair, with respect, that we are entering into debate and I think it would be unfair to the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) if the Chair did not recognize him.

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I really thought this was the place for debate, but it may be that the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey) will have an opportunity to enter into it later and explore the situation which apparently took place in Quebec and which I thought the Liberal government under Jean Lesage would have straightened out as they straightened out so many other things in that province.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to engage in or try to promote any acrimonious conversation or debate. We are too soon after Christmas for that. There is also the fact that, as we all know, it is almost a standardized way of proceeding in this House for the government to prepare and develop legislation and ideas, present them to the House on a take-it-or-leave-it basis and then sit back and wait for the criticism of the opposition and for changes to be put forward. Almost invariably, the proposals for change are not dealt with on their merits but, rather, on the basis of their source.

Regretfully, we find that governments over the years, this one probably more than any other, tend to automatically reject suggestions from the opposition regardless of merit; tends to reject them out of hand because they come from the wrong source. That, of course, does not lead to a very sensible type of legislation.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that with the type of legislation before us that deals with a group of people in the farming industry, in the agricultural section of our economy—a group of people who probably beyond anybody else in society have not got any large degree of authority over their own income, their methods of operation, their own economic well-being—this is the one time when Parliament should settle down and try to examine what we are doing in a sensible, reasonable and logical way.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** That was the hope this afternoon and I am sure it was the hope of members of the Liberal party who spoke earlier. One parliamentary secretary—I cannot recall his constituency—approached it in a rational and sensible way, to examine from a very careful point of view what this Parliament of Canada could do that would be best for the farmers of this nation. Regretfully, the speech we heard a moment ago did not have that tone at all but was designed to antagonize, to be acrimonious and not to seek a logical conclusion to anything, but just to be offensive.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!