

Business of Supply

getting their house in order; there is no doubt about that, as far as I am concerned.

The hon. member from the Creditiste party is not here now, but he said, when he brought in a motion before, that I smiled about his motion. If anything this politician gets criticized for, it is for not smiling enough because I look so sour, too gloomy and too worried all the time about what is going on. This is what I said when I got up to speak about the motion of the hon. member:

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Social Credit party for raising the present topic for discussion this day. They have shown leadership in raising it. The other parties have not seen fit to talk about agriculture on their opposition days.

The hon. member for Elgin recognized how wise was the member from the Social Credit party, so he decided to take a day and talk about agriculture, but he has not been dishonest about what he is because he is an old dairy farmer. He now has a full time job; he has had to give up dairy farming because he is trying to be a studious member of parliament. I congratulate him. Many people do not know the sacrifices you make to be a member of parliament.

I do not think the problem the dairy farmers of Canada have at the present time is anything to laugh about, and if I was smiling that day it was not about the motion the hon. member brought into the House, that is for sure. It was not about the plight I find the dairy farmers in, but I could smile a little about it. However, I can become very angry about it when I hear some of the things some people in Canada are saying about dairy farmers and about what we did. Those people never once recognized that the dairy farmers are very productive, but they suggest that the producers should give away their products because they are so productive. Who else in society do we find who tries to do that?

Have hon. members ever heard of a daily newspaper with 5,000 extra copies at night giving them to a senior citizens home, a hospital, or to the disabled? Like hell they do. They do not give them away, or even sell them at half price. They shred them up because if they did not do that it might hurt their market. But we are supposed to be different. Why—because we are peasants, because we are farmers, or because we are producing food?

Have hon. members ever heard of Chrysler, Ford or anyone else doing the same thing, or have they ever heard of it being done with any other article? Even hon. members of my own party suggest that, which is damned, utter nonsense as far as I am concerned. I was at the Auto Parts Manufacturers Association meeting a little while ago, and they were talking about supply management. I asked whether they build parts for Ford, Chrysler, General Motors, American Motors or International Harvester and hope they are going to buy them. They said, "Do you think we are nuts? We do not turn a wheel until we have an order, and when that order is filled, we pull a switch and put the workers out on unemployment insurance if we do not have other jobs". However, when it comes to agriculture, we are different, we are super, and we can live on nothing.

It costs just as much to produce a surplus pound of milk as it does to produce a pound of milk which has a home. It does not cost a bit less, but the producers in the dairy

industry have become more proficient than they ever were in the history of this nation.

In 1968 there were 150,000 dairy producers. In 1976 there are 87,000 dairy producers. Twelve years ago there were three million cows giving the same amount of milk as two million cows do in Canada today. Efficiency? Yes, but where else in society can that be found? I want to make sure that hon. members on all sides of this House tell the story fairly and squarely about what the dairy producers are doing. This product belongs to the dairy producers of Canada, not to the Government of Canada, and the dairy producers from all over Canada are the ones who sat down in the Sir John Carling Building and decided that this problem must be solved. The producers got into this problem, not solely but mainly, by themselves, and they decided to solve this problem. They knew it would cost them to solve it, but they are solving it because production is coming back in line.

The hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo raised a question about the research station in Kamloops. The research branch intends to fill that position just as soon as we can identify a suitable candidate, hopefully by next week or the week after. There has been no reduction in the efforts at Kamloops since the entomology group was moved to Lethbridge several years ago. No other reduction is planned. Kamloops works very closely with the Lethbridge scientists on the range management program.

I know hon. members may know that the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo chairs a committee of this House, but if they want to read one of the best books ever written by a researcher they should read the one by the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo about range management. I do not know if he worked at Kamloops, but I never knew he wrote that until I went to an international meeting between Canada, Mexico, and the United States at Tucson, Arizona, and there was the book by the hon. member and another researcher from western Canada. However, one of them was our very own member for Kamloops-Cariboo.

Moving to what the hon. member for Medicine Hat said, he talked about stabilization. He said the Agriculture Stabilization Act is no panacea for the beef cattle industry. He said the cattle support should be no higher than the 90 per cent index. I am just a little confused. That does not sound very consistent to me. The hon. member talked about the government being off and on with regard to the beef program.

I want to say something about the Canadian Cattlemen's Association. An official in the Canadian Cattlemen's Association corrected me when I said that some of our programs have meant at least \$100 million more to Canadian cattlemen in stabilizing their industry. He wrote me a letter and said that I was wrong. He said, of all things—and I am sure some hon. members opposite will know better—that I was being too conservative. He said that the programs I implemented, at the request of the association in most instances, to make sure that the beef industry stayed healthy and alive meant more like \$200 million. That is what a top official of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association said.

The hon. member talked about the six provinces which have cow-calf programs. I hope the hon. member was not saying that those provincial ministers of agriculture do not know what they are doing, because they have gone ahead