

Mr. McIntosh: I did not get the import of the hon. member's question. I accept his explanation that he is not trying to be facetious. Some hon. members over here asked to what group he was referring. Are they farmers, are they Canadians? He mentioned the External Affairs Committee? Are they a group of agricultural people from some other country?

Mr. Bell: Yes, Rumania.

Mr. Gibson: It was a farmers group.

Mr. McIntosh: Are they from eastern or from western Canada?

Mr. Gibson: All of Canada.

Mr. Boulanger: We call them Canadians over here.

Mr. McIntosh: Oh, no. The bill before us applies only to western Canada. Let the hon. member read the bill. It does not apply to Quebec, to Ontario or to any other place. That is why I asked the hon. member whether those farmers were from western Canada. I know that farmers in eastern Canada, particularly those hon. members from eastern Canada who are engaged in agriculture, do not understand the situation that exists in western Canada.

I will give hon. members an example of one of the complaints that we raise. I think the hon. member who put the question a moment ago will agree with me that these farmers have a genuine reason for protesting. If a group of farmers in Alberta ship a hundredweight of carrots to eastern Canada, they pay three times more for that shipment than if the same amount were shipped from Ontario to Alberta. I think hon. members would agree with me that that is not fair. These are some of the points that we are talking about. It is very difficult to get these points over to hon. members representing eastern agriculture because eastern and western agriculture are almost as different as day and night. It is difficult to get our point across. However, with two more members after the next election, it will be much easier for us.

Mr. Boulanger: I remember when you numbered 208. What did you do then?

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. McIntosh: I said that the government is trying to get 200,000 farmers off the farms. I do not know what they are going to do. This government says, "Come hell or high water those 200,000 farmers are going." I wish to say to the Liberal whip, and to the minister who is present, that if I read my mail correctly, particularly that which I received during the last ten years, I think I can truthfully say that those 200,000 farmers are saying, "Maybe we must go so far as the government is concerned, but there are too many Liberal politicians in Ottawa. There are at least two too many Liberals representing agriculture, and one as Prime Minister who is not interested in agriculture."

Mr. Olson: All these distortions will come back to haunt you.

Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act

Mr. McIntosh: In order to impress the acting whip for the Liberal party, I would like to quote a front page editorial which appeared in the *Maple Creek News* of April 28, which is not very long ago. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) knows this area very well.

Mr. Olson: I also read the editorial.

Mr. McIntosh: You also read the editorial, but there are a lot of members here who did not. As an interesting aside, I want to tell the House that I understand the writer of the editorial has a Liberal background.

An hon. Member: It serves him right.

Mr. McIntosh: Yes, I think he realizes now that it serves him right. The heading on the editorial is, "Politicians Take Note." It reads:

Even if at times citizens of the country may doubt whether or not a democratic system of government still does exist in Canada (when learning of passage of certain pieces of legislation) there can be little doubt that it does still exist in western Canada.

On Saturday night of last week, when a meeting was held by the cattlemen of the district, it was obvious that this was a non-political meeting. The ranchers gathered because they had a common problem—Bill C-176.

I think the minister has read that bill too.

The ranchers have been given assurance by Premier Thatcher of Saskatchewan that as long as he was the provincial premier there would be no marketing bill to affect the cattlemen unless they specifically asked for such a bill.

Mr. Olson: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIntosh: I continue:

And while this was a noble gesture on the part of the provincial premier, it gives little consolation to the ranchers. For example, even without the marketing bill in Saskatchewan, if the province of Quebec, or any other province does have such a bill and restricts the movement of cattle into that province (unless allowed at a price set by that government) Saskatchewan cattle will not find a market in that province.

However, democracy was apparent at the conclusion of the meeting, when without coercion, or compulsion of any kind, the majority of those in attendance at the meeting lined up at a table in the corner of the hall, to make a cash contribution to fight the bill in any way possible.

It was noted by this writer that many of the people lined up at the table have been staunch supporters of the Liberal party for many years. Yet they contributed substantial amounts of money to fight legislation proposed by the very party for which they had voted. It showed to us that these people were prepared to pay for legislation they do (or do not) want.

It made us wonder if these people that were making the contribution were trying to tell the federal Liberal party something—

It's impossible.

—trying to tell them something that livestock men clear across Canada have been telling them. That they dislike legislation that is imposed against their wishes. Legislation that may destroy the agricultural industry in Canada, and will give state control to the marketing of all agricultural products.

That is exactly what we over here have been saying for months. The minister said that there was no sus-