

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

cept of Bill C-176. I do not have any problems with it, personally, because the people in my riding are very anxious to have the bill passed. We want it passed quickly.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rose:** But the case of British Columbia is a unique one. I was attempting to say that since amendment No. 1 covered a variety of topics, the feeling in Prairie Canada might be put in a sentence: You fellows do what you have done traditionally—manufacture your products behind a protective tariff, and we will buy them—but for God's sake don't also move, with the help of our grain and your integrators, into the thing we do best or we will have nothing left.

The same sentiments of fear were behind the Manitoba brief and relected in an amendment put forward by our party to the effect that under any system of market sharing, quotas be established on the basis of the previous five years of production. This is necessary in order that the Johnny-come-latelys not be favoured. It is important, then, that at least half the growth in consumption in central Canada, where the people live and where the markets are, be awarded and guaranteed to the traditional producers from outside Ontario and Quebec.

If we are to understand the legislation and the amendments put forward by this party and the one we are dealing with by the hon. member for Crowfoot—and I think it is important to understand this—if these fears and concerns are ignored we can expect further depopulation of the Prairies, hence lack of political clout in this House and a pronounced feeling of alienation is certain to develop which will be reflected in more expressions of rural dissatisfaction as was the case in Saskatchewan last Wednesday.

I know the government is extremely sensitive and irritated over the lack of progress with Bill C-176, Mr. Speaker, and in many ways I do not blame them. But the committee received for consideration a rotten bill. It took months for us in the opposition to put it into a shape in which we could support it.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Rose:** To their credit, the Minister of Agriculture and his officials were quite receptive to the many amendments brought forward by the opposition and government members on that committee. Perhaps the minister sensed that Bill C-176 was initially a very ragged piece of legislation. Certainly it ignored many crucial aspects of producer concern. For example, originally there was no explicit confirmation of majority of producer representation on the council and agencies. There is now, Mr. Speaker. Originally, there was no provision for the majority of producers to approve the establishment of an agency before one became a fact. There is now, Mr. Speaker, although the term that the Governor in Council must be "satisfied" of that majority is a trifle ambiguous and woolly for some tastes.

What remains silent in the bill is reflected in the three NDP amendments dealing with market sharing

[Mr. Rose.]

quota growth, control of agricultural imports and right of appeal by aggrieved producers against an agency. It is fair to say, I think, that without the efforts of the opposition parties Bill C-176, despite its shortcomings, would not be nearly as satisfactory an instrument as it is.

On May 10 and again yesterday in reply to my questions, first the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and yesterday the Minister of Agriculture blamed the opposition for impeding progress of this legislation through the House. I think that both these hon. gentlemen should make it crystal clear—in the words of the president of our friendly neighbour to the south—that no member of the opposition party for which I speak has delayed its passage at any time. I invite the government to cite any instance where this was so.

My colleagues and I voted for this bill in committee because we are concerned about Canada's crisis in agriculture. We sincerely believe that the alternative to orderly marketing is a return to the law of the jungle which has persisted in Canadian agriculture for a century. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, why the farmer, alone among all classes of Canadian workers, remains unprotected and a willing victim of the vicissitudes and vagaries—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I indicated to the hon. member for Fraser Valley West that, with reluctance, I interrupted him twice. While I recognize that the two speakers who proceeded him were out of order at times during their speeches, I think it was fair to interrupt him twice. He has now the prize—I have interrupted him three times. The hon. member has been very far from observing our rules and Standing Orders. I plead with him to bring his remarks within the area of relevancy.

**Mr. Rose:** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your patience. To direct my remarks dead-on and precisely to the amendment—and the amendment is extremely tantalizing—what amendment No. 1 suggests in total is the removal of all commodities from the legislation.

**An hon. Member:** No chickens?

**Mr. Rose:** By taking everything out, of course, it can upset no one. But then no one is served either by the legislation. I cannot in all conscience support this, because if everything is removed from the bill what commodity is to be served by the bill? I am concerned about this particular amendment and a couple of others, Mr. Speaker.

This whole concept of national marketing legislation has been called for by the Federation of Agriculture, the National Farmers' Union and our party for years. Regardless of our opposition over amendment No. 1, we have no difficulty in supporting the concept of orderly marketing on a national scale. We have no difficulty in supporting the concept of national marketing legislation, but do not deny us the opportunity of attempting to improve it. Why should we stand up and cheer in this House a bill to deal with national