

would like to express my disappointment that the government has not accepted the original wording of the amendment of my hon. friend from Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave). I am not a professor of English, but let us look at the intent of the original suggestion of the hon. member. He said in his motion:

In allocating additional quotas for anticipated growth of market demand, the marketing agency shall be guided by the principle of comparative advantage of production.

Now we find in the amendment introduced by the government a change in the words "be guided by" to "shall consider". Mr. Speaker, maybe we are playing with words, and maybe we are not. As I look at the situation I begin to wonder whether or not there is not a trade-off between the rich provinces of Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia. It bothers me when I see people playing with words, which is what happens when we get into the back rooms of the House of Commons and talk of trade-offs. When talking about a trade-off it is easy to play with words.

Motion No. 27 as originally introduced by my hon. friend from Saskatoon-Biggar was satisfactory and I wonder now what is not satisfactory about it. As I look at the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) opposite, I begin to wonder whether somebody has been playing with words in this particular amendment. As I look at the words "shall consider", I think of what those words would mean to me were I talking about labour negotiations, Mr. Speaker. They would mean absolutely nothing. "We shall consider" could well mean that we shall not necessarily implement that which we are considering.

As we talk to members from all parties in the House of Commons we realize that considerable time was taken up by the various caucuses of the House playing with words and trying to distinguish whether "shall consider" would be better terminology, as far as this amendment is concerned, than "shall be guided by". The original words "shall be guided by", in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, meant shall be guided by the historical rights that we have known for the last five years. Now the wording has been changed to "shall consider" what have been the historic rights of the producers across this nation for the last five years, and I am inclined to believe that the words we have today are not what was intended in so far as this amendment was concerned.

As we look at the population growth across Canada I become all the more certain that the words we have before us today should not be in this amendment. When we consider the type of producers we have across Canada, as we look at the type of control we have in the two main provinces—the population-growth provinces of Ontario and Quebec—and the increased population growth we are seeing in British Columbia, I begin to wonder whether the words we have now, "shall consider", will really serve the purpose which was intended. When we in Canada introduce legislation which should mean something to all of Canada, to all the agricultural producers across this land, then we should not be playing with words. Either we accept an amendment or we do not accept it. In the case before us now, I fear that we may be accepting words in an amendment which may not be in the best interests of Canadian agricultural producers insofar as all their historic rights are concerned.

I wonder, sometimes, about a government which will introduce legislation, such as the Minister of Agriculture is introducing here, when even he himself hesitates to approve certain amendments because they may not be to the liking of his particular constituency. As we see the elimination of the original intent of some of the amendments to Bill C-176, I become very firm in my belief that as far as the government is concerned this bill means absolutely nothing to the agricultural producers of the nation and will mean nothing to the individuals who will be affected.

• (8:20 p.m.)

It is understandable that many Members of Parliament from Ontario and Quebec are here to protect the vested interests of their particular province. As far as I am concerned, I was not elected to represent only the constituency of Moose Jaw but to represent the Canadian agricultural economy as a whole. I do not stand here to suggest that what is happening tonight is in the best interests of the agricultural producers, because it is not. Agricultural producers across Canada will realize that what this government has foisted upon them will do them no good whatsoever. It will be good for the provinces of Quebec, Ontario and possibly British Columbia in the future.

We are here to represent the smallest and largest producers in Canada. We are not here to protect vested interests wherever they may arise. Members of Parliament should know that they are here to protect the agricultural economy of Canada and not to protect only the vested interests of their particular provinces or constituencies. They should be interested in one nation. I shall find it very difficult to support a bill that has been subjected to the type of erosion to which this bill has been subjected. If we are asked to allow this type of tradeoff at the expense of the agricultural economy, it is high time we stood up and said exactly what we think. As far as I am concerned, I am for the agricultural economy of Canada, all ten provinces. I am not here to represent any vested interest.

When we look at this bill and amendments such as the one introduced by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, we must consider whether historic rights will really mean anything in the future. I can only suggest that the people of this country have been taken by a government that is insensitive to the agricultural problems across this land.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Horner: Is the 90 minutes up, Mr. Speaker? If not, I would like to speak.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Has the hon. member already spoken on the amendment?

Mr. Horner: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner).

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): I will not be very long, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the former speaker. There are two aspects of this amendment, the theme of which should be dealt with. Much of the debate of the agricultural commit-