

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

duced or consumed—may pay a normal price. I believe the farmer responded very efficiently with such a production increase that for two years now this government, knowing that the real problem was not a production but a marketing problem, introduced the famous bill C-196.

It may be said that I am not dealing directly with the motion presented by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) whom I would have preferred to see in his seat, for that same amendment was discussed on many occasions during the debate on second reading as well as in the standing committee on agriculture. As I was saying, farmers do recognize marketing as being probably the most effective tool that can be had. When some hon. members suggested this afternoon that we were going to destroy family farming they were merely playing on words for the benefit of the House. I do not think that the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) was serious, any more than other hon. members who made suggestions which to me seemed highly illogical. He may have used the wrong expression, for the one means through which family farms can be established or preserved is precisely this marketing board, which will prevent large producers in Eastern as well as Western Canada from preserving a monopoly. The farmers concerned are not producers tied-up with a co-operative, as someone said this afternoon, but producers who live from their farms and who were clever enough to settle close to a big co-operative—and mention was made of the Granby co-operative.

Those same producers should be allowed to take advantage of bill C-176 so that they themselves—not the government, as the hon. member who spoke before me was saying—would establish marketing agencies. It is the farmers themselves who are asking for them and who are voting for this bill designed to establish marketing boards in their province.

There is no point in exaggerating the way it was done during the 38 committee meetings. There was talk of separatism, of Quebec and the West. I do not think this will lead anywhere.

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is rising on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

Mr. Côté (Richelieu): Yes, but only when I am through, if I may, as I have had so much to say for so long that I would like to complete my remarks first.

Mr. Beaudoin: Agreed.

Mr. Côté (Richelieu): Mr. Speaker, it will be my pleasure when my time is expired to reply to the honourable member for Richmond, and probably enlighten him.

This afternoon, I noted the concern of the member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride) who stated that last March, we wasted time discussing with Quebec and Ontario, and you see that I do not mention western Canada. I also believe that the member for Saint-Hyacin-

the (Mr. Ricard) and the member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) will do their utmost to convince their colleagues to participate in the discussion. And yet thousands of dollars have been wasted because we had no national marketing agency while the farm production in certain regions was out of all proportion with the consumption of neighbouring cities. We, of the federal government, could admit to ourselves that we are to blame, but I have the privilege of stating that we cannot do that. The opposition could say it because this bill would have been passed two years or at least one and a half years ago had we not been prevented from so doing.

It is now thought that this bill would benefit the production of eggs, broilers and poultry meat. How is it possible that a bill can be said to be beneficial in regard to a farm product produced in one region of the country and not to another produced in another region?

The hon. member who spoke before me wished that a more equitable bill could have been introduced.

This bill, which is national in scope, is actually fairer. It is not an eastern or a western bill because it affects the whole range of farm products and I would not like my hon. colleagues, be they of the opposition or otherwise, to try to exclude a particular product alleging that the farmer does not want it. It is not true.

People from eastern and western Canada have asked us why he have delayed passage of the bill. Representatives of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture—which is a national agency—came to us last year, requesting that this bill be passed as quickly as possible. This Federation which groups all agricultural organizations did not request that the bill exclude beef and veal and include only broilers and eggs. It asked that all farm products be included. There are presently two acts and two programs governing these two specific products.

The Canadian Dairy Commission aims at distributing milk at the same price everywhere in the country.

The previous speaker would like Bill C-176 to be similar to the legislation governing the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, I shall reply in the negative. I do not want it. I should even ask this government to withdraw this bill since I do not wish it to have a limited range. I want that bill to apply all across Canada because I am a Canadian.

As a farmer, I am ready to abide by some quotas as concerns some products as eggs and broilers. Therefore, it would be false to say that this bill is to be effective in eastern Canada and not in other parts of Canada. If beef, veal, or pork production is no longer profitable, quotas shall be established not by the government but by the producers, as they recognize that overproduction results in lower prices. If we want a normal price to be maintained, we should be able to abide by some quotas at the consumption level. If we accept to abide by some quotas as concerns eggs and broilers, we should be ready to abide by some quotas also as concerns other commodities. To act otherwise would be very harmful; a second balkanization would occur if this government accepted to have only part of the products under quotas. Then, I would resign, I would oppose the government, whatever its political denomination, because I want the passage of a national legislation.