

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

That is exactly what is being delegated to a council if this bill is passed. We now know that the Canadian public is asking, why was it necessary to have this unusual sitting of Parliament between Christmas and the new year to debate this issue? This is an unusual sitting of the House of Commons. In the history of our Parliament since confederation I do not know if this has ever happened before. Why is it necessary? I think maybe this time we should let the cat completely out of the bag and give the reason.

• (2.50 a.m.)

Mr. Mahoney: Where is your leader?

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, the real reason was revealed in the remarks of the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride) when he spoke on this bill on Tuesday, December 28, as reported at page 10799 of *Hansard*, and in remarks of the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Faulkner), whom I do not see here tonight, when he spoke yesterday as reported at pages 10837 and 10839 of *Hansard*.

When the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu) was speaking on Tuesday, he said:

We are not opposed to Quebec's introducing marketing legislation. They can bring that in; we are not opposing it. We feel they have a right to vote for it, if that is what they want. However, we do not want, and the producers out west do not want, them to tell us that we must accept this bill.

This is referring to Bill C-176. At those remarks the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton rose and said:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has implied that this bill is for the benefit of Quebec only and is against the interests of the west. That is categorically untrue.

The hon. member for Meadow Lake never implied that, but that is why we are sitting here today. The member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton let the cat out of the bag, as did the hon. member for Peterborough at page 10837 of *Hansard* when he said, in part:

—and then the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu) claimed that the Quebec farmers were attempting to foist it on the western farmers.

He made no such claim, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mahoney: Read a little more.

Mr. McIntosh: I will tell you a little more in a few moments. At page 10839 he said:

—somehow this bill was being foisted on western farmers by Quebec farmers.

Further on he said:

It has nothing to do with Quebec farmers foisting something on us.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are sitting here today. In a few moments I wish to document some facts to support my contention. We now know the source and the reason for the pressure put on the minister to pass Bill C-176 at this time without the exclusion of cattle and calves which the minister himself promised to livestock men. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was elected as leader of the Liberal party, and subsequently as the Prime Minister of Canada, there was much rejoicing in certain parts of the country. The statement was made time and time again that he would put Quebec in its place. Little did the people

[Mr. McIntosh.]

realize at that time, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister meant "first place"—and that is precisely what he is doing.

Statements have been made by members of the government during the last couple of days that must not go unchallenged. They sounded very familiar after hearing the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) when he first introduced this measure under the title of Bill C-197. He said many times that members of the opposition were not telling the truth about the bill, and that there was no sustained opposition to it. Similar remarks were made by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Côté) as reported at page 10801 of *Hansard*. These remarks must not go unchallenged either. He said:

It is not an eastern or a western bill because it affects the whole range of farm products and I would not like my hon. colleagues, be they of the opposition or otherwise, to try to exclude a particular product alleging that the farmer does not want it. It is not true.

I have in my files, Mr. Speaker, a petition of 14 pages of names sent to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Agriculture protesting the implications of Bill C-176. I am sure that every member of this House knows the number of coupons the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture received protesting this bill. I think the record should be put straight. The minister is aware that with very few exceptions the cattle and calf people are not in favour of the bill.

The real motive behind the introduction of Bill C-176 is to further appease the demands of the province of Quebec who have been allowed to opt out of other measures which apply to the rest of Canada—the Canada Pension Plan, the medicare plan and, I understand, the UIC bill which the minister is going to put before the House. Apparently they consider that their nurses, school teachers, and so on, are civil servants.

Mr. Mackasey: No.

Mr. McIntosh: Wait till the bill passes.

Mr. Mackasey: The bill has passed.

Mr. McIntosh: It does not make any difference, Mr. Speaker, because the same thing has been admitted by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) with regard to grants given to that province—40 per cent of all grants given by this government go to the province of Quebec.

An hon. Member: You are prejudiced.

Mr. McIntosh: I may be prejudiced, but these are the facts. One must assume that an election is in the offing and that the government intends to use all its efforts to pass the marketing bill as one of the issues in its election campaign in Quebec in an attempt to hold the seats it now has in that province. Many Canadians are asking why, if the province of Quebec is so insistent that cattle and calves be included in the bill when the province produces only 15 per cent of their own requirements. The answer to that question is spelled out by the Minister of Agriculture for Quebec, who said:

Quebec would be interested in the bill only if it included all products.