

The Address—Mr. Mather

they may amend, if need be, the Farm Credit Act, thus enabling the farmers to set up economic units.

Mr. Speaker, the third point I want to raise deals with the Agricultural Stabilization Act. It must be remembered that the dairy industry is the main source of income of the eastern farmers. As a matter of fact, it is the main source of income of 90 per cent of the farmers in my district and in eastern Canada.

And even if the income of the dairy industry equals only 40 per cent of the farmers' total income, the government must undertake at once a review of that legislation in order to ensure a reasonable price to the eastern farmers.

Besides, it is the government's responsibility to seek the advice of farm organizations in order to set prices proportionate to the expenses and the cost of production of the dairy producers.

Mr. Speaker, I also mentioned that we should find an export market while developing at the same time our domestic market.

We have, for instance, Formosa or nationalist China. The Granby farm co-operative has set up a milk powder processing plant.

This plant is very flourishing for the time being, but we must keep working along that line.

On the other hand, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) will leave soon to visit communist China—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[Text]

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, it is said that the value of a speech may be estimated somewhat in these terms. Forty per cent depends on who is making the speech, 40 per cent depends on how he makes the speech and 20 per cent depends on what he says in the speech.

Mr. Knowles: This will be a good one.

Mr. Mather: On that basis I was about to say that I feel my own contribution to the throne speech debate will probably be only one fifth effective, except I am fully convinced that the logic of what I have to say will speak for itself. At the outset let me say that the members of the New Democratic party have no desire to add unduly to the difficulties which face the government at this time, difficulties which it inherited from the previous administration, difficulties which we feel are inherent in our present social order, and other difficulties which it seems intent on manufacturing for itself.

Mr. Knowles: Forty per cent again.

[Mr. Vincent.]

Mr. Mather: It will be recalled that in the last general election campaign, when it was obvious that no one single party would be able to form a majority government, the New Democratic party alone among the parties gave an undertaking to the public of Canada that it would in its representation in the house give time to whatever party formed the administration to begin at least to bring in those promised reforms that whatever party formed the administration had undertaken. We did that, and continued to do that all during the first session of this parliament, with the exception of the basic matter that is fundamental with us, our opposition to the spread of nuclear arms. We went along a good deal of the way with the present administration and tried to show that we were not here necessarily to defeat the government at the outset, but rather to impel it forward, to push it onward and to get the best results for the most people of Canada in the shortest time.

An hon. Member: Is that why you abstained?

Mr. Mather: Yes, that is true. Having that in mind we point to the fact that we are now in a new session and looking back over the backsliding of the government up to the present time we have come to the position where we feel that in the interests of the public of Canada the time has come for us to press the government and challenge it on its backsliding before it backslides out of existence altogether. I have many criticisms to make on this and other subjects. It is only a few months ago that the government was going to establish a 12-mile Canadian fishing limit for the benefit of our fishing industry and our fishermen, as so many countries have done before us. But now we find from reports which reach us from Washington, and go undenied by the government, that the 12-mile fishing limit which the government may establish will be one which will recognize in perpetuity the so-called historic rights of our American friends to the south to fish inside of the 12-mile zone, and as they are the only people who are fishing there anyway it is fairly obvious to a wide section of the fishing industry in the B.C. area that the new 12-mile fishing zone, if established under these terms, may do more harm than good to the industry and the fishermen.

Again, we understood that the government was going to protect the Canadian publications field by introducing legislation which would protect magazines in this country from the unfair advertising advantage enjoyed by the many American publications which flood into this country in an avalanche. Instead we find that the two major invaders in that field, *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, have been