

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the hon. member?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) rises to ask a question.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, in his speech the hon. member referred to the closed-shop concept. He referred to plumbers and doctors. I do not know whether he mentioned lawyers, but he could have. Does he not agree that they have no closed shop if they have the ability to go to university and acquire the knowledge to become a doctor or a lawyer, or if they have the ability to learn the trade of plumber, but that under this bill one would have to have the money to buy the quota no matter whether or not one had the ability to operate the quota after he had purchased it?

Mr. Whelan: You know better.

Mr. Horner: I do not, and if you do, explain it.

Mr. Whelan: First of all, I have had experience with young people who wanted to go to medical school, who were highly qualified but were not allowed to do so. We know that some lawyers in this country are saying that there are too many lawyers. We know that today one cannot become an apprenticed plumber and work as a plumber because there are too many plumbers. I am saying that every way of life has some control over it. Even when one drives a car down the road he does not drive on the right side because he wants to; he does so because there is some kind of control. Even in this House we are supposed to have some kind of control.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to ask the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan), who is a very good friend of mine, what he was alluding to when he said that doctors are controlled by licence. Was it the medical school he was referring to?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Compton. There would have to be unanimous consent for the hon. member to ask a question. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Whelan: As I understand it, they are provincially licensed. If one should go from one province to another it is necessary to obtain a permit to practise in that province. Also, there has not been an increase in the medical schools and therefore doctors are not turned out like chickens and eggs from a poultry farm so that there would be sufficient doctors for everybody. Then we have the situation in respect of immigrant doctors. Why do we not let these doctors come to Canada and go to work? They must have a licence first.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would support me in respect of what he has said, so that the medical schools might be enlarged and the government would provide the necessary funds to run those medical schools.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It seems to the Chair that we are wandering a little further than we should. The hon. member for Compton.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[Translation]

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I would not forgive myself if I did not take part in this complex and socialistic debate on Bill C-176 which proposes that absolute controls be imposed on farmers.

Mr. Speaker, farmers face problems that are particularly difficult, cruel and disappointing. We see today that the results of the so-called reforms in the agricultural field were not very good. Governments, both Liberal and Progressive Conservative, have, in the past, had many ideas to save agriculture.

Farm loans were meant to save agriculture. Three or four other kinds of loans endorsed by both the provincial and the federal governments were devised subsequently. Farmers' unions were also established. Farmers were told: get united, because you are divided, because you do not understand your problems. Get organized with the help of responsible and competent people who will understand your problems and submit them to the legislators who will solve them. That was the solution suggested.

All kinds of solutions were found. Farmers were fooled with so-called solutions and today we are still looking for another solution. Nothing has been found yet.

Never in our history has agriculture been in such a state of stagnation. Agriculture is doomed to failure. Farmers are desperate because they have been ruined under our fine system.

Because they were loyal to the old parties, farmers are now like castaways. They throw up their arms in the air and ask for any kind of life-boat. They are ready to place themselves in any situation now to save agriculture from bankruptcy. The government proposes Bill C-176, telling them how it can control the situation with measures that are even requested by the farmers' union, in the light of studies that have been conducted over the years.

Farmers are surrendering their possessions to an agency that will not even have a sense of responsibility, because they can no longer hold out. They are at the end of their arguments, at the end of the road. They can no longer navigate.

Such is our fine system, that we have favoured for such a long time, and it is the system that the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Côté) asks people to support. The hon. member for Richelieu says: I am a farmer. I know your needs. The only important thing to achieve is the marketing of all your products. That is what will save you.

But we had a lot of saviours in the past. We are still at the same point. We have been saying for 30 years that all these saviours and all these organizations go round in circles without solving anything. Now we have the proof of it and we derive some satisfaction from having warned people 25 or 30 years ago. We told them then that the Farmers Union and the co-operatives would not save them. We told them that they would be saved by money because it would take money to sell their products, because it was necessary to give consumers some purchasing power and because that problem would never be