

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hatchery people run their business and CEMA runs its business. The total over-production of eggs which caused the problem amounted to one-half of one per cent. If the hon. member has any way to solve that problem I think CEMA, the provincial marketing boards and the hatchery people would be most interested in receiving his advice.

Mr. Jarvis: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the minister. In view of the fact that statistics of April this year, for example, showed an obvious over-hatching of chicks which would eventually find their way into the pullet market, was the minister's department not prepared at that time to avert the possibility of those chicks finding their way into the laying market which would obviously create an over-production some months later.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made very plain that there is no control over the hatchery people of this nation in respect of how many eggs they can set in their incubators or how many chickens they can hatch. We do not have that kind of control. The provincial marketing board does not have total control and therefore does not have authority in that area. It is asking for changes so that more control can be established in order to properly stabilize the market and so on. This will all be brought out at the hearing. They will tell us what they have asked for, what they suggested and so on. But I make it very clear that the Department of Agriculture does not run their business. It can advise people in respect of over-production. The publications issued by the department have shown what the department thinks about over-production and so on, but I repeat that if you can show me any industry that can come any closer in estimating the production of such a perishable, fragile product as eggs, that is, not be out more than one-half per cent of total production, I would like to know it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will be recognized for a final supplementary.

Mr. Jarvis: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your indulgence. Would the minister then simply tell the House whether it is his position now that production at the hatchery level should be controlled be it through CEMA, the council or whatever. Is that the position he now takes in respect of hatchery production in the poultry industry.

Mr. Whelan: I said yesterday in my speech that you could not have stability in any market, let alone that involving a perishable product, unless you have some control. That is up to the producers or those who organize this program. This government said it does not intend to run their business. In any country where the government runs the agricultural business there is not over-production but rather under-production most of the time. The problem here is over-production. If we had that problem in other parts of society we would not have the problems we have today.

Mr. Hees: That is the gospel according to St. Eugene.

Oral Questions

TRANSPORT

FREIGHT RATES—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON EXPIRATION OF FREEZE—SUGGESTED RECONSIDERATION OF PROFIT POSITION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the statement made by the President of the CPR, which had the appearance of a decision already made, that there would be heavy freight rate increases when the freeze expires on December 3 which will be made in two or three large bites, may I ask the minister whether the government has any intention of extending the freeze or calling upon the Canadian Transport Commission to severely restrict any proposed freight rates increases of Mr. Sinclair.

● (1150)

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport): I think we read the same newspapers but I am not sure to which newspaper the hon. member referred. I said yesterday or the day before that I was meeting with the western ministers on October 20 or 21. I want to discuss this problem because, as the hon. member knows, the freeze applies only to about 22 per cent of the rates. So we have to see really whether this is something we should maintain or whether we should do something else. But I would like to discuss it with the interested ministers, not only the western ministers because the others are interested also. So at this moment we have no decision but we are considering the matter.

Mr. Benjamin: I wish to ask the minister whether, in view of the profits of CP Ltd. of \$122 million last year compared with \$170 million in 1974 and \$200 million in 1975, and in the light of the fact that the railways have large investments in real estate and other such operations which have nothing to do with transportation, as well as in the light of the very healthy position, to put it mildly, of CPR, he would require the railroad to direct a larger proportion of its profits and capital into railway plant and equipment than into other enterprises.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I think the only comment I can make at this stage is to say I am very happy to see that CPR recognizes that, while it is a very profitable business to move goods in Canada, we will have to take that into account in any future move we will make.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

CONSULTATIONS ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS—SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF TRIPARTITE BODY OF LABOUR, MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNMENT

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. Given the fact that there will be problems resulting from the fact that the government does not have any inflationary policy in particular and noting that last month in Vancouver the minister called for an intensive examination of the collective bargaining process which could involve a tripartite