

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

same right to protection in the market-place as any other group of citizens. If he does not feel that, he should go back to his riding and tell that to the steelworkers union.

An hon. Member: And the lawyers.

Mr. Rose: Should farmers not have the same rights as lawyers, doctors, dentists and others?

Mr. Horner: That is hogwash. There is no foundation for that statement. The hon. member is wasting time.

Mr. Rose: The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) suggests this is hogwash. So far as I know, he has not spoken in defence of the producers of swine. I think anybody who knows as much about hogwash as he does would be up defending the hog producers. Instead, there he sits in his place, picking his teeth.

To get back to the point, much has been made of this business of withdrawing cattle and calves from the bill. Certainly the terms "cattle and calves" has been removed from the bill. I think that was a moral victory or at least, it was a verbal victory and perhaps a euphemistic victory for the hon. member for Crowfoot. If cattle and calves are not included among natural farm products, what are they? So cattle and calves are included in the bill, despite the efforts of the hon. member for Crowfoot, whose efforts I admire. He is a dogged man and doughty—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rose: He is a dogged fighter.

Mr. Horner: If the hon. member were a little more doughty he would go a long way, too.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, I think I have made it quite clear that members of my party do not support motion No. 2 put forward by the hon. member for Crowfoot. If there is to be a marketing act in Canada covering natural products, it should be all-inclusive. That is why we are pleased to support the minister's amendment which included all natural farm products.

Mr. Horner: Why are you supporting the motion now?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We are not.

Mr. Horner: I am speaking of the subamendment moved by the minister. Why are you people supporting it?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, I think you should call for order. In the words of the hon. member's leader, a leader who is not here tonight—

Mr. Horner: Where is your leader? Answer that one.

Mr. Rose: —I want—

Mr. Horner: Where is your leader?

An hon. Member: Where is Alfie?

Mr. Horner: Withdraw that last remark.

An hon. Member: Explain.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Explain.

Mr. Paproski: Shame on you, Rose.

An hon. Member: Where is your leader?

Mr. Mahoney: They don't know where he is, but they know who he is.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose).

Mr. Rose: I was going to ask hon. members on my right who are making catcalls—

Mr. Forrestall: Where is Alfie?

Mr. Rose: —if they would be kind enough to put them in sequence so that the *Hansard* reporter can get them all down.

Mr. Forrestall: Where is Alfie?

An hon. Member: Where is David?

Mr. Forrestall: Yes, where is David?

Mr. Rose: I would suggest to you—

An hon. Member: There are three NDP members in the House.

Mr. Forrestall: Where are the rest? I see five NDP members in the chamber.

An hon. Member: Who are they?

Mr. Forrestall: I beg your pardon. There are only four and a half.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, at long last I am pleased to be convinced that the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) can actually count. He has demonstrated his ability tonight.

Mr. Skoberg: He has not got it right yet.

Mr. Forrestall: Where is Alfie?

Mr. Rose: If we are to have a comprehensive agricultural marketing bill, a national marketing bill, I think it will be necessary to include in it all the products of agriculture. Therefore, we cannot support the amendment that is before us. It appears, on the one hand, to judge from what we learned in Edmonton hearings, that the cattle producers say they want no government interference. They want a continental market. On the other hand, they want tariff protection against Australian and New Zealand beef and they want the cheapest leased land they can get for their product. It seems to me that there is a basic inconsistency in this. So I suggest that the House should not accept this amendment. I think, in view of the agreement that has been entered into and the subamendment that has been moved to clause 2, motion No. 2 in the name of the hon. member for Crowfoot is redundant.