

ers in Canada and, of course, since there is more or less a North American common market for farm machinery, for American manufacturers as well.

The Common Market is not a threat. Japan is not a threat. Their exports are largely excluded by the nature of the monetary policy pursued by the government, deliberately, I am sure. For the government, or for the Leader of the Opposition, to try to sell the idea to the House that Canadian manufacturers need aid from the taxpayer is utter nonsense in the circumstances today.

Consider what is happening in the automobile industry. Prices of certain Japanese cars have increased by \$300, which is more than 10 per cent of the former price—I do not know what the exact percentage would be. Two days ago the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) asked why the price of Canadian cars had increased by a similar amount, and what the government proposed to do about it. He got no satisfactory explanation from the other side. The reason the price of Canadian cars went up by a similar amount was this—Japanese prices had gone up, and the manufacturers were taking advantage of the shelter which was available to them as a result. And the government does nothing to protect the interest of Canadian consumers. Quite the contrary—it proposes to take action which will make the situation worse. It proposes to hand feed industries which publicly threatened the Leader of the Opposition, industries which told him, by means of a letter from the Canada Chamber of Commerce, that he had better get in line and support the infamous bill which is now before the House. The announcement was then made that he would do so. Mr. Speaker, this is a dagger aimed at the heart of maritime and western Canada. It will aid Western fertilizer companies which are presently under investigation in connection with monopoly practices and price fixing.

The price of fuel supplied to farmers, an indispensable part of their operation, has increased by between 8 and 10 per cent. On what basis have prices risen by such an amount? On the same basis as the price of cars went up. It is because the price differential has increased outside Canada and the Petroleum producers feel able to charge the Canadian consumer more. The wages of the people in these plants have not gone up, or if they have the manufacturers have not said so. But the result is that the primary producers are facing increased costs in buying some of their basic commodities. The minister has said that he is concerned for our primary producers. If that is the case, why does he not do something for them?

● (1550)

The minister told the House what was at stake here. As reported at page 4727 of *Hansard* he repeated what he said during his last budget speech. He said:

What is at stake is not the welfare of the corporations and their shareholders. At stake is the welfare of every Canadian. At stake are hundreds of thousands of jobs that today depend on our manufacturers staying in business and retaining their workers. At stake also are hundreds of thousands of good steady jobs in the manufacturing sector and supporting industries that will be required in future across Canada for our new workers. It is critical that we should all have a clear understanding of what is at issue. That is why I am committed and the government is committed to these measures.

I question seriously whether that is what is at stake, Mr.

Income Tax Act

Speaker, but if it is, then the government is meeting the need for jobs in the wrong way. The way to keep people at work in the farm machinery manufacturing industry is for the plants at Brantford, Hamilton and Toronto to produce agricultural machinery and ship it to the farmers who want to buy. There are farmers in my province who want to buy machinery but cannot get it, and I am sure the same situation must prevail in Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba and other provinces. Surely, Saskatchewan is not the only province whose farmers cannot buy machines because they are not available.

I see the minister is smiling. He changed the tariff on cattle imported from the United States. Perhaps he would care to read or have one of his assistants read the *Cattlemen* magazine, which reports that this action has resulted in a larger flow of feeder cattle to the United States with a heavier flow of butcher cattle from the United States into Canada. As a result of government policies, our processing industries in western Canada are likely to be less busy, not more busy, than they were before. According to this magazine, we are experiencing record heavy levels of carcass beef imports from the U.S.A., and Canadian cattle feeders are buying fewer replacements because of competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis U.S. feeders. As the magazine says: "Strike two against the feeder".

I suggest in all seriousness that the minister should examine the results of his policy. One of the main basic concessions cattlemen had, the basic herd, has now been removed because the minister assured us at the time that this concession was unnecessary. However, he has failed to convince the *Cattlemen* magazine, because they present the following bill of goods with which they are charging the government:

1. Early 1972, cow-calf operator at bat. The federal government in new tax laws took away the basic herd provision from purebred and commercial breeders . . .
2. The federal government health authorities suspended DES usage while American cattle feeders continued use . . .
3. The federal government . . . removes the tariff on beef imports from the U.S.

That, Mr. Speaker, is how the government is treating agriculture, one of the biggest job producers in the nation. While the federal government is acting in this way, the provincial government of Saskatchewan has to buy an interest in a packing plant to ensure it will continue to operate in that province. In his speech on June 14, the minister expressed great concern about the food industry. As reported at page 4763 he said:

By far the greater inflationary pressures confronting us in Canada today are worldwide in their origin. The major upward thrust here and abroad has come from a sharp rise in food prices.

Magnificent! Wonderful! The point is, it is only partly true; it is not entirely in accord with the facts of life. I have just put on the record what has happened to the beef industry which will result in slowing down beef production in Canada. There are other prize examples. One of the most recent is the decision, taken over a year ago by the government, to slaughter two million hens and to compensate producers for that slaughter. What has been the result? Fewer eggs, fewer broilers, or both? Poultry products have reflected one of the sharpest increases in price. Why did the government take such action? They took it because they had two alternatives. They had the choice