

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

Mr. Horner: There is one other quotation I would like to put on the record. We now have an agricultural bill in which supply management is limited to poultry and poultry products unless the other producers want to be included. On February 25, 1971, I made the following suggestion to the committee, as reported at page 44 of the committee proceedings:

Mr. Chairman, just before we get into the depth of the committee's studies, I would like just to put forward a suggestion to the committee. Here again the suggestion being one which I think would facilitate the passage of this bill through the House. In fact I can foresee this bill being passed by this committee today. I just throw this out as a suggestion. I would be prepared to withdraw my subamendment if the mover would be prepared to withdraw his amendment and that clause 2(c) be changed to read:

'farm product' means any natural product of poultry and any product derived therefrom.

I went on to say:

If that definition were accepted, we on this side particularly could see a situation where we would be through with this bill today and it could go back to the House. We could deal with it early next week. It could become law, as far as we are concerned, before the end of next week. I just throw that out as a suggestion to you, Mr. Chairman, to show some degree of a spirit of co-operation to facilitate the passage of this bill.

I said that in all seriousness. The minister, who was a witness before the committee, said at page 25:45:

Mr. Chairman, there are other groups representing other commodities—and a most outstanding other example that comes to mind is the potato industry—who have been seeking ways and means for a long while to have an orderly marketing of their product and to have a co-operative effort set up between the provinces to put that in place.

He continued on page 25:46 as follows:

What would happen as a result of Mr. Horner's suggestion, if the bill was amended that way, would be that we could deal with a crisis situation such as the broilers and eggs at the present time; but I have to say this, and I say it with all the kindness that I can muster, that I have heard on many occasions, members of the opposition, including Mr. Horner, accuse the government of not dealing with problems until they get to a crisis situation.

The minister went on to say that he wanted potatoes to be included in the bill. We have heard nothing about the potato industry today. I said at page 25:47:

Mr. Chairman, and correct me if I am wrong, I could be wrong, but did we have any potato producers appear before the committee?

I was in a conciliatory mood. The fact of the matter is that I was agreeable to including vegetables in the bill. I recommended that clause 2(c) be amended to read:

(c) 'farm product' means any natural product of poultry or turkeys, and vegetables and any product derived therefrom.

I suggested that that amendment would include within it potatoes. I will not read everything I said because my time is limited. I said that I would move that amendment so that clause 2(c) would apply to the poultry and vegetable industries and products thereof. The minister said no, he wanted everything included in the bill.

I hope hon. members of the House realize that this bill does not really apply to any commodity except to eggs and poultry. If the egg and poultry producers want to come under the law, they must so signify. If they want supply management provisions to apply to them, the government of the day—and I do not think it will be the government opposite—will have to come forward with an

[Mr. Speaker.]

amendment. It will need to introduce another bill which will say that the supply management concept shall apply to the product of that industry. So in closing I want to say that in the climax of this debate the members of the opposition have made most constructive suggestions and moved constructive amendments to this bill. It was only through heated, long-winded and very detailed debate that we were able to accomplish what the country wanted with regard to this bill dealing with the marketing of agricultural products.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I cannot shoot or shout as well as the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), but I will do my best for a few minutes. It seems strange that not long ago the stabilization bill was before this House, and now we are considering Bill C-176. The official opposition has tried to be all things to all people and the hon. member for Crowfoot, in particular, is trying to take the credit for what has been accomplished. The hon. member suggests that through his efforts the bill will do exactly what he wants. It is only proper to say that an amendment brought forward by my colleague for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose), which was not accepted, spelled out that any natural, agricultural product ought to be included in the bill. Surely the hon. member for Crowfoot should realize, even though he was not in the House when the amendment was moved, that he should not crow about what this bill accomplishes. He was not alone in suggesting what should be included in the bill.

• (4:10 a.m.)

I also noted that a short while ago the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle) mentioned the fact that he was in the chicken industry in Edmonton, and I would like to tell the House that my parents happened to buy chickens from Pringle Hatcheries in the city of Edmonton and as I look at the bill now and realize that the hon. member is also involved with Maple Leaf Feeds at this time I am wondering whether this bill is designed to protect the individual producers or whether it is to protect Canadian Packers, Maple Leaf or Ralston Purina. These are the areas of concern we should have, Mr. Speaker. These are the areas which we should examine to determine whether or not the bill the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) has brought in is really intended to protect the producers, or whether it is in reality intended to protect the large corporations.

A short while ago the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) referred to the absence of some hon. members from the House. I do not see him in his place now, but I would suggest—

Some hon. Members: He is there.

Mr. Skoberg: Oh, yes, I see he is in his seat, Mr. Speaker. He is in his stall. The hon. member suggested that unless the various leaders of the parties were in their places in the House, it meant very little. I would like to respond to him by saying that we in this party are able to delegate authority without any problem whatsoever.

Some hon. Members: Oh!