

marketing agencies for farm products, be amended by adding the following to subclause (c) of clause 2 at line 17, page 1:

"except cattle and calves and products of beef and veal".

Motion No. 3 reads:

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 to subclause (c) of clause 2 at line 17, page 1:

"except hogs and pork products".

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, we are dealing with motions Nos. 2 and 3 together. I do not want particularly to cause a vote or to take up very much time, but I believe an explanation is necessary. The hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) has already moved a subamendment to motion No. 1 which suggests that cattle and calves should be exempt from the provisions of this bill. I shall not ask for a roll-call vote on motions Nos. 2 and 3, but now that the House has seen fit to limit this bill so that the supply management aspect of it applies only to the poultry industry I see no purpose in the bill applying to the cattle industry.

Some might say that the cattle industry, the hog industry and all other industries can organize national organizations, and that the national organizations can concern themselves with research into producing better products and better marketing facilities. The Canadian Cattlemen's Association is a national body. It has a check-off in four of the ten provinces, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario. An amount of ten cents a head, or part of it, for every head of livestock sold in those four provinces goes toward the maintenance of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association as a national body. Any other association can join and enjoy the check-off privileges.

An hon. Member: Is that a privilege?

Mr. Horner: Yes, it is in respect of such a worth-while body. The Cattlemen's Association has done a great deal of work with the Canadian Department of Agriculture in trying to bring about a better system of marketing. This association has involved itself deeply in the marketing of its product. If cattle and calves were included in this bill, this would give food for thought to those who are opposed to the Cattlemen's Association, which is now established, in respect of setting up another national organization.

With two national organizations there could be a dispute concerning where the check-off money should go. In fact, the Cattlemen's Association, which has done so much good work in market research and research generally, would probably end up in a dispute as to which organization the check-off should go. This would probably destroy the Cattlemen's Association and it might take five or six years to get another one back on the road.

There is no need for cattle to come under the provisions of the bill. At the present time cattle are not included in the provisions of the bill, because an application can be made to have cattle come under the provisions of the bill but this will never happen. This is not the case in respect of the hog industry. This industry does not have a national organization. There are provincial organizations and provincial check-offs for some of the provincial organiza-

tions, but there is not a national check-off similar to that in respect of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association.

With that clarification in respect of some of the negotiations of a week or so ago, most hon. members realize there is no purpose in cattle being included and the amendment moved by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek might as well be accepted. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) promised a long time ago that he would take cattle and calves out of the provisions of the bill. He has not demonstrated clearly that he really wants cattle and calves excluded from the provisions of the bill.

This amendment and the amendment moved this afternoon give the minister a clearcut opportunity to vote in respect of his earlier intention of allowing cattle and calves to be removed from the provisions of the bill. Without saying any more, I am prepared to not call for a roll-call vote in respect of motions Nos. 2 and 3, and if the House wishes we might proceed to another group of amendments.

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to these amendments relative to the exclusion of cattle and hogs from the provisions of the bill, I should mention that there is great concern even on the part of people who have accepted the concept of provisions being included in the bill by means of a national plebiscite. Let us look at the provincial figures. I have the figures for the last census, namely, 1966. The farmers who raise cattle, hogs and sheep are grouped together in this listing. In Ontario there are 28,809; in Alberta, 20,418. Dairy farmers are listed separately. There are 21,000 of them in Ontario, which would leave a net balance of about 7,000 beef or hog men. In Alberta, if you subtract 2,000 there are about 18,000 left.

• (8:40 p.m.)

The fear that these people have with regard to a plebiscite is that a plebiscite of the majority of producers in other sections of Canada, other than those where the bulk of beef or hogs is raised, by virtue of the number of producers could very well bring the other portions of Canada under the Sections of the act. I think it is very important when we look at this bill that we identify who shall be classified as a producer. I do not know how we will do that under any concept of supply management, because all the dairy farmer of Ontario or Quebec has to do is keep back his steer calves, feed them out, and he is a bona fide beef producer just as much as the man in the west who does nothing else for his livelihood but raise cattle. He also is a bona fide meat producer.

This is the kind of problem and concern that is worrying people and brings members such as the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) to their feet wanting the specific exclusion of cattle and calves. They realize that if it comes right down to the people who are actually raising beef, numerically speaking in any plebiscite they would be at a disadvantage. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question that has always haunted beef and hog men. I am referring to how a national plebiscite could be conducted. I will quote an excerpt from the *Farm and Country* magazine of December 21 to illustrate what goes