

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion amending clause 18 of Bill C-176. I agreed with the provincial ministers of agriculture that this motion ought to be put forward. I move:

That clause 18 of 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, immediately after line 38 on page 13 thereof, the following subsection:

"Limitation (3) A proclamation referred to in subsection (1) or (2) that designates a farm product other than eggs or poultry or any part of eggs or poultry shall not set out as a term of the marketing plan that an agency is empowered to implement any term that would enable the agency to fix and determine the quantity in which any regulated product could be marketed in interprovincial or export trade by persons engaged in such marketing thereof."

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it. I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion (Mr. Olson) agreed to.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear you ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will appreciate that we are now placed in difficulty. The unanimity to which the hon. member refers and to which I referred originally was to put the motion. I would not want the hon. member to be placed in a difficult position. I think everything is being done by consent and by agreement between parties. When the hon. member earlier brought to the attention of the Chair that he proposed to make a motion and referred to this particular proposed amendment to clause 18, the Chair indicated to the hon. member in question and the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) that, in order to be able to propose a motion, unanimous consent would be required. That is why I hesitated before putting the motion and looked in the direction of the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh), expecting that he or other members would indicate they were not willing to give their unanimous consent. That would be my interpretation of the rules and interpretation of the situation.

We have now reached the position where I have put the motion without objection from the hon. member or from the hon. member for Joliette. I am open to comments from hon. members who might assist the Chair in this difficulty.

24725—59

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, on any occasion that I can remember when unanimous consent of the House was required the Speaker usually asked if there was unanimous consent. If Your Honour did ask it on this occasion, I missed it. That is my point.

Mr. Speaker: The point is well taken. I indicated to the hon. member that my understanding was that there might not be unanimous consent. The matter having been raised previously today, I expected that if anyone did not wish to give his consent, that would be indicated to the Chair. I assume the hon. member for Joliette is in the same situation, that he is not prepared to give unanimous consent to this motion.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[Translation]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, are we still debating the matter of unanimous consent on the motion moved by the hon. member for—

Mr. Speaker: The difficulty that the Chair is facing at this time is that the minister moved an amendment to clause 18 of Bill C-176. Prior to that, it had been suggested to me that neither the hon. member for Joliette nor the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) would give consent to this motion or this amendment moved by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson). I did not hear any objection at the time I was going to put the motion, and I wonder if the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple has indicated that he was not ready to give his consent in order that the motion be put to the House. Actually, I wondered if the hon. member for Joliette had any representations to make on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is an amendment moved by the Minister of Agriculture. Since he was kind enough to send me the text of his amendment, I shall certainly agree with him.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: In equity and justice I really do not think the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) and the House would want the motion be put again. It was understood that there should be unanimous consent and there was unanimous consent. I do not see how the motion could be put formally to the House.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I think the point that has been raised is an important one. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) did ask for consent, the motion was put and it was carried. It was only at that point that the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) raised his point. Now, it often happens that a proceeding takes place and the member may not be alert to what is occurring. However, it seems to me that the House by a voice vote carried this amendment. It was put to the House and up until the point at which it had been carried there had been no objection raised, even though at the very moment the minister got on his feet he said he was asking for unanimous consent to put his motion.

Mr. Horner: On this point of order, Mr. Speaker, I realize and recognize the dilemma you are in. I understood the