

"exactly the same kind of legislation—There is no difference in their legislation and what is proposed in Bill C-197." There is a difference. The minister has proved it himself. We are interested in the fine print of this bill.

Even if there were no difference, there is an altogether different story between having legislation in a provincial House and having the same kind of legislation in the federal House. For example, jurisdiction over education rests with the provinces. When it rests with the provinces, it is a safeguard. If it were a matter of federal jurisdiction, we would be concerned. Hitler proved what could happen when he had control over the youth of his country. Such a situation could not develop with this type of legislation.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Even if the legislation were the same, which it is not, there would still be an argument against this bill. This point glaringly illustrates that the minister has misled this House. Not only has he misled this House but he has misled the farmers and farm organizations, although they have not yet recognized this point. This is the point we want to uncover, the principle behind this bill. It has been said time and again by members of the opposition parties that they find no fault with a national marketing board provided there is producer participation. This is what the farmers want. This is what the minister is denying them. The farmers want a national marketing board with producer participation. They will not get it through this bill. We are afraid of this. The minister also said:

This legislation only provides for control over interprovincial and export marketing, and gives the government no authority whatever to control marketing or production—

There are several clauses in this bill which refer to production. I shall read clause 22:

The objects of an agency are to promote a strong, efficient and competitive production and marketing industry for the regulated product or products in relation to which it may exercise its powers, having due regard to the interests of consumers of the regulated product or products.

The farmers of this country do not want control over production in any shape or form.

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

**Mr. McIntosh:** The minister stated that our objection to certain provisions in this bill "is an amazing exercise" and beyond his comprehension. He seems to be imbued with the idea that now that he is the Minister of Agriculture at long last, he has been given some

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

responsibility as a member of the cabinet and he and he alone knows what is best for those engaged in the production of agricultural products. I wish to refer to the closing remarks of his speech to which I referred a moment ago. I shall read the last paragraph of the minister's speech as recorded at page 7002 of *Hansard*:

There may be some opposition to this bill from across the way, but this does not in my view constitute sustained opposition from the producers of this country, and it is in their interest that I am bringing this measure forward.

The minister did not say the government is bringing this measure forward; he said, "I am bringing this measure forward". That statement and the statement of the minister a few months ago demonstrates to the House the arrogance of this man. It shows that this man is power hungry. He wants power at any price. We know what his sojourn in this House has been. The minister will do anything for power—even deceive the livestock producers in his own constituency. It was not only an arrogant statement but a stupid statement for a minister to make. He is a prime candidate for a stooge in a state dictatorship. That is where we think this bill will lead.

**Mr. Olson:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I have already pointed out, I have no respect for what the hon. member says. However, I cannot sit here and allow the hon. member to abuse the rules of this House to the extent to which he is now doing. I respectfully ask Your Honour to remind the hon. member that the dignity of this House needs to be preserved. If the hon. member wants to make remarks in this House, he must respect the dignity to which we have become accustomed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I realize that arguments in this House are sometimes strongly worded. It is sometimes very difficult for the Chair to distinguish the difference between what amounts to very strong language, and unparliamentary language. I am trying to be as fair as possible to hon. members, both of whom the Chair must respect. I have been listening carefully to the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. Despite the strength of his language, I do not have the impression that he is going too far. Of course, I am subject to error as well. In light of the minister's interjection on a point of order, I appeal to the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. Up to now I think he has been following what amounts to a very fine line.