

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

lish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Horner (p.6719).

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, prior to five o'clock I was endeavouring to explain to the House how difficult it is for the members on this side of the House to determine the principle behind this bill. We know that it is not what the minister has told the farmers and farm organizations, that is, a national marketing board with producer participation. We think this bill disguises the complete takeover of the control of the agricultural industry by the government.

**Mr. Olson:** Of course, that is not true.

**Mr. McIntosh:** That is what the minister has been saying for some time. The minister has interjected from time to time. Practically every time a speaker rises, the minister says, "Read the bill". We have read it and re-read it, Mr. Speaker. Also, we have read the statements the minister has made in this House. He has mislead this House and misinformed the farmers and farm organizations. It was on this point that I was speaking at five o'clock. I wish to refer to it again and point out to the minister some of the statements he has made. I am going to repeat the statements which are not true. The minister said, as recorded at page 6998 of *Hansard*:

—I wonder why provincial governments, with exactly the same kind of legislation on their books—

The minister knows it is not exactly the same kind of legislation that is on the provincial books. He further stated:

There is no difference in their legislation and what is proposed in Bill C-197.

There is a great difference, Mr. Speaker, and the minister knows it. Why should he try to mislead the House with a mistruth like that? In fact, in the same speech on May 14 the minister contradicted himself.

**Mr. Olson:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not particularly sensitive to the remarks of the hon. member.

**Mr. McIntosh:** I couldn't care less.

**Mr. Olson:** I couldn't care less, too, because really I have no great respect for the member's opinion on anything. However, the rules

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

of the House are such that this type of language is against the rules. I could refer to citation 154 or 155 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, or to May's seventeenth edition, where there are many examples of unparliamentary language. In my view, if this language were allowed it would in effect degrade this House. I am not interested in what the hon. member says about me, for the reasons I have already expressed, but I would hate to have the situation where this unparliamentary language was allowed to be used and became a precedent, so that other hon. members could with impunity use this kind of language and degrade this House for which I have a great deal of respect.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On the point of order raised by the minister, it is certainly the tradition and practice of this House than an hon. member does not suggest, intimate or otherwise state that an hon. member has been deliberately misleading the House. I have been listening fairly carefully to what the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) has been saying. I hope he has not been saying that, and as I interpret it he was not saying that. I am sure the hon. member would be the first to recognize that this would be unparliamentary. He is a member who has had a great deal of experience in this House. The point of order having been raised, I simply seek the co-operation of the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek in conforming to this long-standing tradition.

**Mr. McIntosh:** I wish to continue with my speech, Mr. Speaker, and if the minister wishes to rise again he may. I said that the minister used the words "exactly the same kind" although he knows that is not true. He also said, "There is no difference in their legislation". I say that the minister contradicted himself in his speech. If he did not, he can explain to the House what he means by these words:

I know that there are variations in the details of provincial legislation for the setting up of specific marketing agencies.

Just after the minister said they are "exactly the same", he said, "I know there are variations". It is the variations of the details with which we are concerned, Mr. Speaker. It is all very well to say that the government has control of marketing, or does not have control of marketing, but there is here the difference between day and night. The minister misled this House and he misled the farmers and farm organizations when he said it is