

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Mr. Speaker, within the terms of the amendment, could the hon. minister say how he interprets the words:

—any natural product of agriculture—

[*English*]

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, I do not really believe that I should be giving a legal interpretation of any words in the bill at this point.

**Mr. Horner:** Is it not crystal clear?

**Mr. Olson:** Yes, it is crystal clear to me. The words, “any natural products of agriculture and any part of any such product” mean the products that are produced in agriculture—any state of being in its natural form, I suppose, before it is processed in any way, whether a little processing or a lot of processing is involved. That is why we use the words “products of agriculture in natural form,” plus “any part thereof”. This bill was not intended that its provisions were going to follow through all of the products of agriculture in their most refined, processed form. That is why we talk about the natural products of agriculture and any part thereof.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Then, would the hon. minister—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. With respect I hope that all hon. members will remember that we are working under a time limitation, an order limiting speeches to ten minutes. I did ask consent for one question but the Chair would hesitate to ask hon. members to consent again since other hon. members are waiting to speak.

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up much time speaking on this amendment; I simply wish to move an amendment to the motion already before the House. In passing, however, might I say that I have listened to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) use the term “contradiction”. I am not surprised to hear him use this word because he is a past master of contradiction. I refer specifically to the promise he made to the cattlemen of western Canada, both orally and in writing, which he did not keep.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey):

That the motion be amended by adding thereto, immediately following the word “product” at the end thereof, the words “but, for the purpose of any of the provisions of this act, shall not include cattle or calves;

I am quite sure that if his words mean anything the minister will be pleased to have this amendment. I am also quite sure that the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Howard), who was concerned about cattle and calves, would be prepared to second, third or fourth it.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair has the amendment of the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) and is prepared to accept it if there are no objections. I think procedurally we can accept it at this point.

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that at report stage no amendments are permitted, unless, as in the case here, an order to that effect is passed.

**Some hon. Members:** No, no!

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** No. Get into your rules.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** As I understand it, the Chamber has before it a motion by the hon. member for Crowfoot, seconded by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek, which has been amended by an amendment in the name of the President of the Privy Council, seconded by the Minister of Finance. We now have a proposed sub-amendment, moved by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek, seconded by the hon. member for Battle River. In these circumstances it is my understanding that no notice is required.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, I was out of the Chamber for just a moment but I am sure Your Honour would realize that this proposed amendment is a sub-amendment to an amendment, which of course is not permissible.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** No, no! Come on!

**Mr. Peters:** You are not that dumb. You have been here for a couple of years.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, let us not take too much time on this. The motion presented by the hon. member for Crowfoot is not an amendment, it is a motion. The proposition presented by the President of the Privy Council is an amendment to that motion. This, therefore, is a sub-amendment, and I suggest it is quite proper under the provisions of Standing Order 75(8). I am opposed to its substance but I think we must agree that it is in order to move both an amendment and a sub-amendment to a motion that has been proposed at the report stage, provided, of course, that it meets the rule of relevancy, as I believe it does.

• (4:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, may I rise briefly on the point of order and say that there is no substance to the proposition of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson). We have just finished the tax reform bill and we all know that in connection with that bill there were amendments to amendments to amendments to amendments.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The point of order was raised by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson). The Chair agrees with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). We have before us a motion in the name of the hon. member for Crowfoot, and an amendment in the name of the President of the Privy Council. So that we now have before us for consideration an amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. In the opinion of the Chair that is quite in order. If there are other observations—not on this point I might add, since it seems to me that the point is clear—I will be glad to entertain them. Otherwise I will put to the House the amendment of the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek.

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I am not in favour of the amendment, although I think it clarifies