

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

the bill as a whole but we have no mandate to speak on behalf of producers of other farm products.

Following our appeal concerning such an exemption, we were given written assurances by the Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. H. A. Olson, that our product would be exempted. However, in spite of three separate appearances before the standing committee on agriculture, the majority of committee members forced the inclusion of our product in this bill.

Our position can be briefly summed up as follows.

When a proposed legislation affects some sector of our society while it was not sought nor wished for by that sector, when it cannot be proven that the proposed legislation is essential to the general interest of society, we consider that government has no right to impose such a legislation to such a sector.

If you agree with this proposition, we suggest that you should admit that the beef industry is entitled to exemption from Bill C-176. We have challenged the supporters of this legislation and the members of the Committee on Agriculture to show us how general interest will be served by the inclusion of our product, and they could not take up the challenge. We have explained that we were not seeking nor wishing for such a legislation. Therefore, we suggest that our right to an exemption from this legislation is evident for all those who care for justice; therefore, we call upon you to support our claim for exemption from this legislation.

The beef producers are still strongly attached to democratic principles allowing popular participation in the working out of a legislation and representative government. Although our efforts aimed at exemption obtained consensus among beef producers and their representative bodies throughout Canada, up to now our appeals have not been listened to.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that such a letter is self-explanatory. The associations of cattle breeders in no way want this legislation to apply to them; they do not even want to hear about it. I believe that the House has no right to force upon a group of producers a legislation which they do not want.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Speaking briefly to this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, while I agree in general terms with my colleague from Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle), I must emphasize that there is no truth in the rumour that we are actually relatives.

In speaking for my party I should like to say that we do not support the motion advanced by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). I can understand why he and the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey) feel strongly about this motion, since they represent ridings in which the cattle industry is prominent.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) might be similarly affected by this, but while he did agree, under some kind of pressure of which I know nothing, to withdraw particular reference to cattle and calves prior to the second set of committee hearings on the bill, I think it should be pointed out that it was not he who put cattle and calves back in the bill but rather the committee. It is only fair to state this. I notice the minister smiles. He has not smiled a great deal lately so I do not mind his smiling now.

I can understand the position of the hon. member for Crowfoot and the hon. member for Battle River; they are concerned because the cattle business is an important industry in their ridings. However, Mr. Speaker, I really could not understand the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander). I do not know why he was taking part in this debate at all. The hon. member for Crowfoot scowls at me now but it was he who complained bitterly about

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

the time being taken up on this particular motion on the grounds that we wished to get to some other amendments before ten o'clock. I should like to point out to him that three Conservative members spoke—

Mr. Alexander: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton West rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Alexander: I think the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) believes that he has the wherewithal to become involved in a debate such as this. I should like to advise the hon. member that we who have been elected to sit in this hallowed Chamber have every right to discuss any matter that comes before us as parliamentarians. He may think I know very little about agriculture, but I certainly know that when my wife goes to the grocery store to buy foodstuff she is very concerned about prices. All I am trying to do—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton West has the floor on a question of privilege. It seems to the Chair that if he has such a question he should state it very briefly.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member, being a gentleman, should withdraw the remarks that he made questioning my right to take part in this debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Alexander: I will not insist, but I should like a ruling from the Chair to the effect that whenever a member feels the urge—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Alexander: —to become involved in a debate in this House, he should be allowed to do so. Qualifications or brilliance are not required; the only requirement is sincerity. I hope the hon. member who has the floor will offer an apology and will, in his usual charitable way, withdraw the unkind remarks he directed at the hon. member for Hamilton West.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, as usual, when the hon. member for Hamilton West rises to make any point or ask a question, his remarks go on for hours.

Mr. Alexander: Withdraw!

Mr. Rose: I am usually persuaded by his remarks. Therefore if I have said anything to offend the hon. member certainly I will be pleased to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. Alexander: That was close, but not quite good enough.

An hon. Member: Take advantage of that, Rose.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And a happy New Year to both of you.

Mr. Rose: I would ask the hon. member for Hamilton West if he does not feel that farmers should be given the