ley." Now barley is a glut on the market and growers in southwestern Ontario are facing disaster. It is privately admitted that they were given bad advice and that they should have been growing wheat.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Canada cannot continue to have government by promise. The Minister of Agriculture is asking Canadians to accept this bill on faith. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) did the same thing with respect to Bill C-259. He promised amendments after he had tried out the bill on Canadians. He invoked closure to get his way. Now the Minister of Agriculture is about to try the same thing. Why the rush?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the hon. member who has just ended his speech will accept a question, I will recognize the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Côté).

[Translation]

Mr. Florian Côté (Richelieu): The hon. member said a while ago that in 1962, the price of pork was 27 cents a pound. Does he know that in 1959, the price of pork was \$17.80 per hundredweight? I sold some myself. The price went up to \$27 per hundredweight afterwards. A lot of farmers gave up because the minimum price was abolished. They gave up hog raising and as a result of the production margin, the price of pork went up in 1962.

[English]

Mr. McCutcheon: I had great difficulty with the translation, but what I did understand was really nothing to answer. I shall be happy to sit down with the hon. gentleman and discuss it. Maybe, despite our different languages, we could get together. I could not understand the question through the babble that came to me. I don't think the hon. member made any sense in the first place, but I will be glad to talk to him.

Mr. E. F. Whelcn (Essex): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up very much time in this debate, but as a farmer and as a Member of Parliament representing a farm area I think I should make some comments on the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). I ask Your Honour to let me know if I stray too far afield, but I listened yesterday and today to everyone who spoke and it seems to me that they not only covered the whole field but, if I may say so, they covered the whole agricultural plain.

If these amendments were allowed to pass in the form suggested by the hon. member for Crowfoot, it would be like pulling teeth from a watchdog and then training him to bite a chicken thief. It would be like removing one or two legs from a good cutting horse and then expecting him to do the same job of sorting for you. It would be like watering down a drink 90 to 1—your imagination would have to do a lot for you.

I can remember my uncles talking about prohibition days and about a certain farm process; I suppose one could call it that because farm products were used in it. A man engaged in the manufacturing business lived in the area. Every time he made a new batch he had to choose a new name. He liked his brands to have a proper title. My uncles, being of Irish descent, were always available to sample these new brands. Mr. Speaker, these amend-

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

ments put me in mind of the brand they called "Love in a Canoe"—it was almost water.

Mr. Hees: That's not the way I heard it.

Mr. Paproski: It has been watered down.

Mr. Whelan: Well, this brand was watered down so much that nobody would buy it. And I, for one, will not buy this bill if it is watered down as much as the hon. member would wish. All my farming life I have been associated with marketing boards. Every crop I grow is under the jurisdiction of one board or another. These boards are provincial; if they have any fault, that is it. Their jurisdiction does not extend beyond the Ontario border. If I said they were perfect, I would not be stating the truth. But let me say, as the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. McCutcheon) has just said, they are a lot better than nothing. The producers who use them, that is to say, the vast majority, would not be without them.

The hon. member for Lambton-Kent talked about hog producers. They have the right to reject marketing boards in Ontario. They tried it once, maybe twice, but it was always voted back in. This puts me in mind of a great co-op man who is no longer with us, Father Cody of St. Francis Xavier's University in the Maritimes. He was travelling around, spreading his ideas among farmers and on one occasion he was riding on a train in Annapolis Valley listening to a couple of apple brokers conversing in their seats ahead of him. One of them said, "It is clear what these farmers are getting ready to do. They are getting ready to sell their own apples." The other commented, "What right have they to do that? They know nothing about selling apples, nothing about business." At that point Father Cody could stand it no longer. He stuck his head between the two men and asked, "And who in hell do they belong to in the first place? They are the farmers' apples, are they not, and haven't they the right to sell them?"

Mr. Speaker, I never saw anything which comes even close to the propaganda which has been used to try to scare people about the legislation before us, unwarranted, most of it. Anyone who is making these misstatements is either ill-informed or is purposely doing so in order to divide the farmers across this land for his own selfish interests.

As I say, every crop grown on our farm is under the jurisdiction of a marketing board of one kind or another. These boards are all democratically elected. If producers do not like them, they can throw them out. Indeed, meetings are to be held starting next June in each district in connection with one of these boards. The farmers who send their produce to this board can elect whoever they please, and they do so. Every now and again they turf out some of the members, as is the case in this House. And some of them should be turfed out.

Mr. Alexander: Don't get into personalities.

Mr. Whelan: Consider the board which controls the production of vegetables. This board has the right to negotiate prices, it has the right to set all sorts of conditions on sales. The growers have no right to sign contracts until the board announces that it has reached agreement with the processors who will use the crops. There are