

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): If the plumber is an independent contractor he will qualify.

The Chairman: Shall Clause 1 carry?

Mr. Rodriguez: I just want to continue that, Mr. Chairman. There are many electricians and plumbers and other skilled tradesmen who are not on a private contract. They work to a contract, but when there is an emergency they are called out. Why should they not qualify on the same grounds as doctors and lawyers?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): In a good many instances that expense is covered by the employer.

The Chairman: Shall Clause 1 carry? The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman, I have another question—

The Chairman: Order, please. I recognized the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, this is the most ridiculous—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Benjamin: This is one minister I always thought would not allow himself to be party to such outrageous nonsense as this. The plumber, electrician, or a similar tradesman who is an employee of a firm or is on a special contract, is paid a salary and maybe called out. What about the foreman at the steel plant who is called out on an emergency at three o'clock in the morning and has to make a 40-mile round trip? He does not get the rebate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Four o'clock.

Mr. Broadbent: Four o'clock.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I hope it is beginning to dawn on the minister how ridiculous this move is that he is using to try to collect \$525 million. We are not going to hold still for it.

The Chairman: Order, please. It being four o'clock p.m. it is my duty to rise, report progress, and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of this House.

Progress reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being four o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions, public bills, and private bills.

● (1600)

[Translation]

Mr. T. Lefebvre (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, I think there is agreement to proceed to the consideration of notice of motion No. 40 in the name of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin).

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Is it agreed that we proceed to the consideration of notice of motion No. 40

Milk Producers

appearing in the name of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin), and stand motions Nos. 2, 15, 19, 20, 34 and 37, at the request of the government?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[Translation]

AGRICULTURE

SUGGESTED STUDY OF INDUSTRIAL MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, a study should be made on industrial milk-producers in order that the government take the necessary steps to guarantee to these producers prices that would take into account production costs in view of reducing the number of industrial milk-producers who abandon their activities.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to take part in the House in a debate on the motion I have introduced and which is very important. I even suggest that it is of utmost importance to Canadian agriculture and especially to the dairy industry. My motion reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, a study should be made on industrial milk-producers in order that the government take the necessary steps to guarantee to these producers prices that would take into account production costs in view of reducing the number of industrial milk-producers who abandon their activities.

However, Mr. Speaker, I must mention that I moved this motion in the House on October 10, 1974. Which means that the government dragged its feet heavily before allowing it to be debated and this in spite of the problems facing dairy producers, whom I mean to defend this afternoon.

It is a pity the government should let situations such as this deteriorate. Nevertheless, I am glad my motion is debated today. Not only is the issue still relevant, it is still more so in view of all problems which have compounded the situation since last fall, as well as those which the government has created through its incompetence and lack of initiative in the area of industrial milk production.

Not only has the Department of Agriculture failed to take adequate steps to support our dairy milk producers, it has made life even more miserable for them by doubling from 45 cents to 90 cents a hundredweight, effective July 1, 1975, the costs which Canadian dairy producers must pay for their exported products. Anyway, the Agricultural Producers' Union and the Federation of Industrial Milk Producers of Quebec wasted no time in reacting, and rightly so, because the situation is becoming increasingly critical.

In fact, those 90 cents that are withheld from the producers on powdered milk, exports, will mean that every industrial milk producer will lose an average of \$2,000 annually. To my mind, that is utter nonsense. One does not need the brains of Papineau nor those of several ministers put together, the majority of whom are lawyers, to know that this step will simply ruin again hundreds of our milk producers. And all the more so because produc-