

*Egg Marketing Committee Report*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but the hour appointed for private members' business has expired.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[English]

**EGG MARKETING****CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. McGrath that the first report of the Special Committee on Egg Marketing presented to the House on Monday, December 16, 1974, be concurred in.

[Translation]

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, as I was saying when the House called it five o'clock, CEMA was created as a result of the adoption of Bill C-176 at the end of 1971. Under that act, Parliament decreed that the provincial marketing boards should take into account the interests of both producers and consumers, and that the National Farm Products Marketing Council should supervise the application of the act.

Mr. Speaker, it has always been my understanding that Bill C-176 was intended as legislation to ensure co-operation between the producers, on the one hand, who deserve remuneration for their products and a reasonable profit margin to allow them good enough an income to provide for their families decently, and the consumers, on the other hand, who should be able to purchase quality eggs, in adequate quantities, and at a reasonable price. I therefore saw this legislation as a means to come to a better mutual understanding and to establish within our boundaries the marketing of an essential farm product in a way which would have met the aspirations of both consumers and producers.

The facts revealed to the committee showed that despite instructions from Parliament, the National Farm Products Marketing Board and the CEMA have neglected the interests of both producers and consumers as regards egg marketing. This is unfortunate, but those are the facts which came out of our meetings in this committee.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the lack of planning before CEMA began its operations and the poor quality of its administration are at the origin of the failure of this marketing program. The evidence showed that there was little or no cooperation between CEMA, the National Farm Products Marketing Board and the minister himself.

The committee could not examine the reports of the CEMA and National Farm Products Marketing Board meetings because there were no such reports, which is

[Mr. Milne.]

extremely irregular. I have always understood that if an agency is legally constituted, it must keep minutes of its meetings and of the decisions that it makes so that those responsible for the control of the operations may report to whom it may concern at the appropriate time and place.

During the discussion on Bill C-176, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) and myself had emphasized the need for an effective control on imports and exports. We had requested at the time that section (2)c) of Bill C-176 include any imported natural product, while the bill mentioned only any Canadian natural product. We wanted to include the provision that any imported natural product must be submitted to the same marketing requirements as Canadian farm products.

I well remember, Mr. Speaker, that during the night of December 30, 1971, when I was sitting exactly where my hon. colleague from Moncton (Mr. Jones) has just sat down, I had moved, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond, an amendment to Bill C-176 to include in the act the provision that imported products should be submitted to the same regulations as Canadian products, in other words, that any imported natural product should be marketed through marketing agencies so that these boards could control the need to import or export such or such a product.

● (2010)

Indeed, if one refers to the proceedings of December 30, 1971, one finds that at that time the amendment was put and the government side voted against the inclusion in that legislation of regulations to have imported natural products marketed in the same way as Canadian products.

Today, we find ourselves faced with a problem that would probably not exist if we had more assurances that that problem would have been solved by CEMA because they would have had efficient means to prevent importers from importing eggs when Canada did not need them. That is where the crux of the problem lies. We found in our discussions that it was mainly the importation of eggs for consumption, table eggs, as they are commonly called, when we did not need them that caused the problem. Those eggs were marketed without being indented while the eggs of Canadian producers remained in storage, and those places had no rotation system, that is, eggs were coming in and out by the same door.

As often eggs were imported and took the place of Canadian eggs on the domestic market, Canadian eggs aged because they remained at the back of the storage and could not be taken out. That led CEMA to order the destruction of a certain amount of eggs that were no longer fit for consumption.

Mr. Speaker, what is the point of having a Canadian Farm Products Marketing Act if we give free course of action to profiteers who import products and market them when we have domestic producers who cannot dispose of their production. They are profiteers, people who take advantage of a situation, who take advantage of a market to make profits while our farming organizations such as our Canadian Marketing Agency should be struggling in an almost impossible situation. To my mind, nobody here