

Supply

Mr. Rose: They ought to move into this kind of market-sharing arrangement and establish co-operatives. "Co-operative" really has a nice sound, much nicer than "dog-eat-dog competition." I know that certain agricultural undertakings can survive under competition provided, for instance, there is tariff protection against cheap Australian beef. If our people can buy a piece of land in the east at ten cents an acre and obtain freight rate assistance, they can survive as free enterprisers. The attitude is: Just leave us alone. Just help us, but do not do anything else to us. I think the Hoss Cartwrights will disappear if they are prepared to make their particular product the luxury food that nobody can really afford.

• (1600)

I received representations from several farm organizations, or organizations relating to farming matters, and farmers with regard to taxes on market-sharing quota sales. I will give an example of how this operates. If a farmer who has an egg quota in my constituency wishes to get into the business, and this is where I agree with the hon. member for Crowfoot—

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): He needs a rich father, aunt or uncle.

Mr. Rose: What is so odd about that? He could steal the land from the Blackfeet for nothing.

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): "Blackfoot."

Mr. Rose: I am speaking of them collectively.

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): It is "Blackfoot" collectively.

Mr. Rose: If he wishes to get into the egg business, he would have to purchase 20 cases a week. Ninety-two hens equals a case of eggs. The hens he buys from the man who wants to get out of the business cost 10 cents each, or 20 times 92 times 10 which is \$18.40. If he wishes to get into the business, the cost to him is \$6,000. He goes to the tax department and says that this is really a capital expense. The tax department says no, it is not, because market-sharing quotas have no value. He is told that he purchased the business for \$6,000 but the hens he purchased are worth \$18.40. Nobody could eat them; he probably buried the hens after he bought them. He gets this tremendous right. What he does is purchase a right to sell. I understand the misgivings of the hon. member for Crowfoot. He purchases a right.

The Chairman: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member and the members with whom he is chatting, but the time allotted to them has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to take part in this debate. First of all, I wish to congratulate the new Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) for being so sincere and above all so convincing when he speaks to the producers.

One can tell he himself is a former producer: he knows quite a lot about production costs; he knows that the farmers must also make profits, if profits can be made in agriculture.

[Mr. Horner (Crowfoot).]

I am also happy to speak on behalf of the farmers of eastern Canada on the important question of the credits the Department of Agriculture earmarks for financing federal assistance to the Canadian Livestock Feed Board, and to Canadian agricultural production and market.

At the start of my remarks, I should like to point out that it has become important and interesting for us, members of the opposition, to speak in this House since the start of this session. Formerly, when we were led by a majority government, no matter how much we shouted ourselves out of breath telling parliament what the people liked or did not like, we were not listened to. The Canadian people showed the government we were right. Not only does the government listen to us, but it listens closely to what we have to suggest. Its political life is at stake, and if it does not want to be inflicted parliamentary death sentence, I advise it to listen carefully to our suggestions and criticism. Today, I shall limit myself to agricultural production costs and profits.

Until now, I voted for or against the government, depending on the legislation proposed to us. I am proud that I am absolutely free to decide how I will vote, and not always bound to vote against the government as the progressive conservative party seems to be, nor always for it as the NDP has been since the start of the session.

The estimates that we are asked to approve are not sufficient in my opinion as far as agriculture is concerned. This is obviously not enough. In my area of the Eastern Townships and in my constituency particularly, farmers received a small cheque of \$400 lately, in respect of the bad crops of last year. How is it possible, Mr. Chairman, for a farmer to recover the loss of more than 50 per cent of his hay production with \$400 per year?

Almost every day, we hear statistics to show that farmers' incomes have increased at an astounding rate for the past year. Some people even talk of a 40 per cent increase, and I refer to Mr. Toupin or his acolytes in the province of Quebec.

It is very easy, Mr. Chairman, to play politics on the farmers' backs. However, the facts are not what Mr. Toupin believes they are, as reported this week in *La Terre de chez-nous*.

If such were the case, the government would not have accepted in the first place to give farmers \$400 to compensate for the loss of crops due to bad weather. Farmers would not have to hold weekly auctions the likes of which have never been seen. Moreover, youth would be interested in becoming farmers, which is certainly not the case now.

Mr. Chairman, any one could tell me that everything is all right, that milk price is at its best, that the world demand for feed grains is the strongest ever recorded, but those are only words. The farmer who has to buy machinery or dairy cows to increase his herd knows how difficult it is to finance those investments while the labourer, who has only his lunch box to finance, earns \$4, \$5 or \$6 an hour. Furthermore, in order to buy, control and finance his operation, the farmer must borrow money at a rate between eight and nine per cent. In the case of farm machinery, they pay up to 13 per cent interest to financial sharks, whoever they may be. The working man does not