

Surplus Egg Reduction Program

• (1430)

[Translation]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, the minister began his statement with the following paragraph:

I am pleased to be able to announce that negotiations and discussions have been successfully concluded with the provinces—

That means an agreement is still possible. I continue to quote:

—and producer groups and that a program designed to adjust egg production to market requirements has been developed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I imagine that the subsidy mentioned by the minister will be added to the amount received when the fowls are killed. I fear that this will be a double-edged knife considering the short delay specified. In fact, if the objective is reached in less than six weeks, I foresee the danger of having a market over-supplied with fowls and, consequently, a drop in prices which are already very low.

We read recently in a farm weekly that in the week of May 31 producers received 12 cents a pound for fowls of 7 pounds or more, 10 cents for 6-pounders, 7 cents for 5-pounders and 6 cents for fowls of 5 pounds or less. Such prices are very low. So, if the market becomes suddenly overstocked, I am afraid prices will drop and grants paid by the Department of Agriculture will accordingly lose their value.

Egg producers have been experiencing great difficulties for a very long time and it should be pointed out to the House that even in January 1972 the amount paid to them averaged 15 cents a dozen, while the production cost ranged from 30 to 32 cents. This is an interesting problem which should be considered.

If, according to the announcement made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), the proposed means are such that they will make it possible to reach the objective, that is the establishment of a long term policy to stabilize the situation and to give a certain degree of satisfaction to egg producers, all the better. But right now, the situation is distressing.

Mr. Speaker, according to the price list that we have been supplied with, producers received 26 cents for Grade A eggs during the week of May 24 and 20 cents during the week of May 31. These losses are extremely high and there is real danger that many producers will very quickly be moving towards bankruptcy.

If we really have surpluses in Canada—I would not know if it is true or not, but someone must know it—it means that we have a great production capacity. On the other hand if there are people who don't have any surpluses and are hungry, we should send them our surpluses. Such a gesture would enable some human beings to consume them and satisfy an essential need.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that one day at the Committee on Agriculture I was interested to hear a good Liberal member made a statement on the planning, the orientation given to agriculture by some economists who, after having tried for 10 years, admitted that their recommendations and planning had failed. Yet they do not give us any alternate solutions.

[Mr. Gleave.]

We have visited in Canada big egg producers which should be doing well. However, there are proofs big producers have difficulties; production is not always efficient enough to allow benefits when the production cost is higher than the sale price. What we need is a miracle and I do not think it is possible these days.

* * *

[English]

POLLUTION**CHERRY POINT OIL SPILL—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43**

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 43 I wish to request the unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion:

That in the light of the damage in Canada and the United States arising from the recent oil spill at the Cherry Point refinery this House support the urgency of a reference to the International Joint Commission of the environmental consequences of the movement of oil in the narrow waters of the Straits of Juan de Fuca, Georgia Strait, and Puget Sound both now and in the future and of the measures necessary to minimize the hazards, and requests the Secretary of State for External Affairs to immediately convey the terms of this motion to the government of the United States.

Mr. Speaker: This motion is proposed to the House under the terms of Standing Order 43 and requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, since the hon. member for Egmont was the first to move a motion on this matter three days ago, we naturally will support this motion wholeheartedly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: This motion by the hon. member for Fraser Valley East shows that there is at least one Liberal who knows something must be done.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member kindly indicate who the seconder is?

Mr. Pringle: The hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson), Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: If there is unanimity, the motion will be put. There appears to be unanimity.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order that the hon. member who spoke before me raised. Not only the hon. member for Egmont—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!