

• (8:30 p.m.)

I believe that any branch of the industry, whether it be people producing honey, people producing fruit or any other agricultural commodity, should have the opportunity, if they feel it is in their best interest, to place their industry under the marketing bill. Once they are in and they find it works to their disadvantage, they should be allowed to opt out. This is different from the provinces opting in or out. If there is to be marketing legislation, it should be nationwide—but producers should be given the choice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Speak on the amendment.

Mr. McIntosh: I am on the amendment. In order that the provinces understand this bill, the minister said he made many trips across the country and had many meetings with the provincial ministers of agriculture.

Mr. Horner: People do not believe him any more.

Mr. McIntosh: It would seem to me, from the statement made by the Quebec Minister of Agriculture, that the minister did not correct his misunderstanding of the bill because the Quebec Minister of Agriculture made the following statement to the committee: If you are going to sell in Quebec, you will produce or offer for sale according to Quebec dictates.

Mr. Horner: That is what he said in Quebec City.

Mr. McIntosh: The minister rose in the House on a number of occasions and at meetings in western Canada and said: You people do not have to fear. There is no production control in this bill in any shape or form. This is what he said when we challenged Bill C-197 which was the forerunner of Bill C-176. Either the minister has misinformed the provincial ministers of agriculture or he has misinformed the people of Canada. It is up to the minister to decide.

Mr. Horner: He has misled both.

Mr. McIntosh: I ask the minister whether in the light of subsequent events he has in any way changed the view which he expressed in the House as recorded at page 7002 of *Hansard*:

There may be some opposition to this bill from across the way, but this does not in my view constitute sustained opposition from the producers of this country, and it is in their interest that I am bringing this measure forward.

I ask the minister whether he has in any way changed his views since he made that statement. I would also ask: Does he believe that this bill is still in the best interests of the farmers, of the livestock producers?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I suspect that the House wishes to have a fairly wide-ranging debate tonight. But the Chair has a responsibility, as I pointed out previously, to suggest to hon. members that there are Standing Orders and precedents which indicate that we should deal with the particular motions before the House. I know the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

(Mr. McIntosh) is attempting to keep his remarks relevant, but I suggest that he might be ranging a bit far. I ask him to come back to the matter at hand.

Mr. McIntosh: In view of your remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will relate the rest of my remarks to the statements that were made by the three speakers from this party when the bill was before the House on April 27 and 28. But before doing so I should like to ask the minister how sincere he is now in regard to the promise that he gave the livestock producers. At that time three of our members rose in the House and put forward the policy of our party to the people of Canada. They were the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth), the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey).

The hon. member for Kent-Essex told the House that the bill is based on the fact that all agricultural products in all areas of Canada should be covered in a national marketing scheme. He said he is concerned about the provision in the bill making it possible for the government to delegate provincial authority to national marketing agencies and the federal authority. He said it is expected that the two working together in harmony will bring about the hoped for adjustments. But the provincial authority is delegated only by negotiation and the provinces can opt out of the measure entirely or on a commodity by commodity basis. He said that the second major weakness of the bill is that there is no import control in the legislation. He said much more, but finally he said that if the primary producers find this act detrimental to their industry, there is no provision for a plebiscite or for any similar approach so that such an agency could be disbanded.

Many people are deeply concerned about what is happening to this country of ours. This situation was referred to in the speech of the hon. member for Crowfoot on April 27 or 28. He said that many people are deeply concerned about the direction in which we appear to be heading by the introduction of legislation such as contained in Bill C-176. In fact, the manager of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, Mr. C. Gracey, asked the following question:

Has democracy temporarily vanished from Canada or, if not, how does this participatory democracy work?

Also, the editor of "Cattlemen" magazine, which is widely read in western Canada, said that if Bill C-176 is passed in its present form it will result in financial disaster for Canadian cattle producers and will prove participatory democracy to be the greatest hoax ever foisted upon us.

Reaction of the Canadian public after the introduction of the white paper on tax reform would seem to indicate that the people were going to be given an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process in respect of tax reform. We were deluded into believing that this type of action was participatory democracy, in the same way that the ranchers and the cattlemen were led to believe that if they got to the minister and obtained a promise from him, they could participate in any legislation governing their industry.