noteworthy probably more for that which is not in it than it is for that which is in it and what it is supposed to do. To make a very simple observation, one can only say again that agriculture has been shortchanged by this government.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) spelled out at great length the disastrous impact the United States import surcharge would have on the agricultural industry, and then failed to give us any assurance that the impact would be relieved by governmental action. He indicated that processing plants would have the opportunity to apply for assistance under the program. However, there is nothing in this bill that will give the primary producers any assurance of relief. In two sections of his speech the minister pointed out that there will be a serious disruption in the market and that the impact of this measure will be severe. Certainly, it will be severe because generally the import surcharge affects roughly 25 per cent of our exports which go to the United States. In respect of agriculture, however, it will affect some 65 per cent of our exports. Surely, if that is the ratio in which the effect will be felt, there should be ample justification for singling out agriculture as an industry which will need the greatest amount of assistance.

In looking at some of the effects on agriculture, I wish to point out the severity of these effects in respect of our markets. This has been outlined in fairly succinct form in the *Alberta Wheat Pool Budget* of September 3. In order to give members some idea of the impact this measure will have on Canadian agriculture, I should like to refer to the resumé of the *Alberta Wheat Pool Budget* which indicates the difference in tariff that will be paid on goods going into the United States. Of course, this resumé deals generally with those products which are exported from Alberta to the United States. For example, Canadian fresh pork exports, which were worth $24.1 million last year will now be paying 2.5 cents per pound instead of 0.7 cents per pound. Bacon and ham, not canned, the exports of which amounted to $3.4 million last year will pay 3.25 cents per pound instead of 2 cents per pound. Live dairy cows worth $11.9 million will pay 3 cents per pound instead of 0.9 cents per pound. Cattle over 700 pounds, amounting to $11.4 million, will pay 3 cents per pound, an increase from 1.5 cents per pound. This item, of course, is subject to a global quota of 400,000 head.

Then we come to barley. The other evening we tried to raise this matter when the Minister of Agriculture gave us no assurance or hope in respect of the grain trade. Barley exports, worth $12.6 million, which paid 7.5 cents per bushel will pay an additional 10 per cent of purchase price, a total levy of about 21.5 cents per bushel. This is an increase which certainly will affect the market so far as world competition is concerned. We are still smarting from the results of the unpegging of the dollar last year which resulted in a 6 per cent increase in the price of export commodities, particularly grain, while we were trying to maintain the competitive position of our feed grains and malting grains in the United States. Malting barley worth $2.5 million will pay 40 cents per hundredweight, an increase from 30 cents per hundredweight. Creeping red fescue seed, worth $3.1 million, will pay 2 cents per pound, an increase from 0.5 cents per pound. Animal feed, worth $4.2 million will pay 14.5 per cent ad valorem instead of 4.5 per cent ad valorem. Brewers grains, worth $5.9 million, will pay an additional 10 per cent of purchase price on the present 22 cents per ton.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Biscuits and other baked grain products worth $10.7 million will pay 13.5 per cent ad valorem instead of 3.5 per cent ad valorem. Live swine, worth $4.3 million, will pay 2 cents per pound from 0.6 cents per pound. Seed potatoes, worth $3.2 million, will pay 10 per cent of price plus 37½ cents per hundredweight, a total of about 90 cents per hundredweight. These adjustments will have serious effects on agriculture in Alberta and in Canada, yet there is nothing in this bill to signify that any positive action is going to be taken to directly assist the primary producers.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Mazankowski: At page 7588 of *Hansard* for September 7, 1971, the minister said that programs will be initiated to provide:

—for the losses or some of the losses that have been suffered as a result of disruption in those market areas as well.

We heard that same old story last year when the unpegging of the dollar seriously disrupted the agriculture industry and we are still waiting for some relief there. I am sure that all hon. members and people of Canada realize that agriculture is in a most seriously depressed state, and when you add this burden to those engaged in the industry, it spells disaster for many.

The minister says that we are going to use the provisions of the Agricultural Stabilization Act but we have seen very little use of that act which was brought forward in 1959. It is a very good act and if used properly would do a lot to alleviate some of the pressures we now face in agriculture. The relevant factors to be taken into consideration are clearly spelled out in section 2, subsection (2) under the heading "relevant factors" which reads as follows:

In prescribing a percentage of the base price of an agricultural commodity under paragraph (a) or (b) of the definition "prescribed price" in subsection (1), the Governor in Council shall be guided by the estimated average cost of production of the commodity, and such other factors as the Governor in Council considers to be relevant.

Certainly, that gives the Governor in Council adequate and sufficient powers to guarantee prices to the producers, based on the relevant cost ratio. We have seen what has happened to the price of eggs and pork across the country. The minister has seen fit to withdraw the wool subsidy which threatens that industry, but at the same time he maintains that we must diversify. The sheep and wool industry is one example of the possibility of diversification from wheat and other surplus commodities. However, this bill has not been used to give the producers that added price protection, although there is adequate provision in it. If it has not been used up to now, what assurance is there that it will be used to alleviate the impact of the import surcharge as a result of the American action? There is no assurance at all. It is just a bunch of political haymaking.

As I said before, we have a situation in agriculture where farm incomes are depressed and rural communities are being desperately affected. Small business enter-