

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) to say that he realized he would have to have unanimous consent to put this motion. He did not really ask for it. I, along with the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh)—and *Hansard*, of course, will bear out exactly what was said—listened to Your Honour to hear whether or not Your Honour posed the question “Is there unanimous consent for the minister to put his amendment?”, and I did not hear it. Although I favour this amendment I realize the dilemma you are in, and I appreciate the graciousness of your decision to acknowledge that the question was not asked.

This is an amendment which all agricultural ministers want. It is an amendment that the Minister of Agriculture wants. It is an amendment which the government wants, and I would assume that if we cannot accept it here it could be placed in the bill tomorrow by the Senate. That august body in the other place could well handle this chore, I believe.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, if it will help you or the House, in view of the fact that there was a misunderstanding I will accept the fact that I was trapped in this regard and I will allow your ruling to stand.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member. He was trapped with the Chair. We were trapped together. Certainly I appreciate the hon. member's decision to agree with the position of the Chair and his understanding of the difficulty in which the Chair was placed. I apologize to the hon. member if I placed him in that difficulty. I attempted to explain the situation a moment ago. The hon. member knows I did not do anything to try to place him in an embarrassing position. That being the case it is assumed that the question has been put and has been carried on division.

The next question is on motion No. 27. It is moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave), seconded by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters):

—That Bill C-176, An Act to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, be amended by adding the following immediately after the heading “General” at page 18:

“24. A marketing plan to the extent that it allocates any production or marketing quota to any area of Canada, shall allocate that quota on the basis of the production from that area in relation to the total production of Canada over a period of five years immediately preceding the effective date of the marketing plan. In allocating additional quotas for anticipated growth of market demand, the marketing agency shall be guided by the principle of comparative advantage of production.”

and by renumbering subsequent clauses accordingly—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is understood that there is to be an amendment to this motion which will be proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen). Therefore I shall take only a minute or so to place the motion before the House. In other words, the time for the debate on the whole proposition would more appropriately come after the government's amendment has been moved.

[Mr. Horner.]

The purpose of this amendment is to include what we regard as a very desirable provision in Bill C-176. If this amendment, is carried, as I hope and I believe it will be, it would provide that before any marketing agency which is established under this legislation can set up supply management plans or set quotas it must consider the distribution of production over the preceding five years. In other words, the purpose of this amendment is to have regard to historic rights, particularly of the prairie provinces, and we feel that this amendment has been worded in such a way that it protects those rights without taking away rights from any other section of the country.

We also feel that with an amendment such as this something can be done to offset the kind of dangers which arose when the provinces set up their own provincial limitations on the import of produce from other parts of Canada. All told we think this is a very desirable addition to the bill. It would write in a new clause 24 in the terms outlined in the amendment and succeeding clauses would be renumbered accordingly. Therefore I have pleasure in submitting the motion for the consideration of the House.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has mentioned that it was proposed I would move an amendment to this particular motion which is in the name of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave). The amendment I would propose would accept in large part the motion as it is but would attempt in the last sentence to change the wording, with the purpose of providing the marketing board or the marketing council or the marketing agency with some flexibility in allocating the future growth of market demand.

Therefore I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson):

That Motion No. 27 by Mr. Gleave be amended

- (a) by striking out the words “after the heading General” and by substituting therefor the words “before the heading General”
- (b) by striking out the words “be guided by” and by substituting therefor the word “consider”; and
- (c) by striking out “and by renumbering subsequent clauses accordingly” and by substituting therefor the words “and by renumbering subsequent clauses and correcting cross-references accordingly”.

● (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion. Is there agreement?

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this amendment submitted originally by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave), who is now enjoying sunnier climes, I hope, I would like to say how much the agreement with the other parties in the House has meant to us. I am certain this will be a very valuable provision for producers in what I call prairie Canada. Most of them call it western Canada, but I who consider myself to be from the true west regard the three provinces as prairie Canada rather than using the larger, generic term “western Canada.”

I say at the outset that I am almost speechless because some of the things that I was going to say in support of this amendment have already been uttered capably and