

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): I do not know; Mr. Walls does not state that in his charge. I know for a fact, however, since this so-called price formula came into being producers in the west have sold their eggs for less than 25 cents a dozen.

Mr. Gardiner: Eggs were 85 cents a dozen.

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): I do not care what they were to the consumer; that is not the point I am making right now. That is the reason I think this government does not have an adequate floor price, certainly not to the producer.

What is the situation with respect to this matter? There is a guaranteed floor of 38 cents a dozen to the people who store the eggs. And how is the price to the producer arrived at? The producer stands all the shot for every single cent of the cost in relation to the eggs, with plenty of spread for everyone. Today the producer pays for the transportation, the washing, the oiling, the fillers and the crates, and for the interest on all the money involved. In addition, when these eggs go into storage and come out six or eight months later they are degraded; about 20 per cent of them are "rots" or cracked. The producer pays for all of that, because the cost of degrading is deducted.

Mr. Gardiner: Will my hon. friend tell me why it is that in the province of Ontario they have 18 or 20 boards to look after the kind of thing he is talking about in order to see that it is done properly, and can he tell me why we have none in Saskatchewan?

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): I will tell you why—

Mr. Gardiner: Because you have a C.C.F. government, that is why.

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): In Ontario it is done under the co-operative marketing act. Last year united farmers' organizations in Saskatchewan tried to promote the idea of marketing boards, and we had the packing companies through their stooges throughout the province discredit that type of organization to the producers. That is why we do not have them.

Mr. Studer: Why didn't the government do it?

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): The fact is that we have not—

Mr. Studer: Why didn't the government do it?

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): Has the hon. member for Swift Current got verbal constipation, or what is wrong with him? If he wants to make a speech he can do so when I am finished.

Mr. Fulton: I think he has verbal diarrhea.

Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): We in this group, and I think it will be supported by all hon. members in the house, hope the government will see fit to bring in a comprehensive national agricultural policy by which we can provide parity prices for the producer. That is all we are asking for. We want a fair price for the producer that will give him a fair return for his labour, and I do not think that is asking too much. I believe it is not good enough to just have a floor price to the packer. We need a policy that will provide a floor price to all agricultural producers. I think this can be done under the Agricultural Prices Support Act and under the co-operative marketing act.

I dislike to receive letters like the one attached to these receipts, which is a case where a producer is caught in the price squeeze. As I have indicated, he shipped four grade A hogs to the packing plant and got a net return of \$18.75 per hundred. That is not all, Mr. Chairman. I wish to point out an even greater injustice than that. In the degrading of hogs when there is a heavy run on the markets, the packers can pick up hogs pretty well at their own grade.

I am not satisfied to have the minister get up and say that we have government graders and all the other nonsense. I should like to see some way by which the producers can know they are getting a fair deal in respect to the sale of their hogs. I would like to see something done so the producer would know that he was getting a fair deal in respect to the sale of his hogs.

The receipt I have here shows that this man shipped two hogs which were graded as C. Their weight was in the 120-185 bracket the two weighing a total of 241 pounds. But the price received was \$3 per hundredweight less or \$15.35 less than for grade A hogs. On the other side of the receipt are set out the classifications under which a farmer must sell his hogs. I am all for the grading of hogs, but I submit that the weights are most unfair to the producer. The grades are A, B1, B2, B3, C. D. lights, heavies, extra heavies, sows No. 1 and sows No. 2.

If a hog is sent in that is one pound over weight, in other words if it weighs 171 pounds, it would be outside the grade A classification and the farmer would automatically get \$3 per hundredweight less. I think this is something the minister should look into. Last year we had a debate during which we tried to determine whether the producer was getting a fair price for his livestock products. I am sure that in this country there is no justice or fairness in what the producer get