

corn. There is still a tariff on corn coming into Canada from the United States. If the Minister of Agriculture wants cheap corn for eastern farmers, as he said on October 17, why does he not remove the tariff? It would be less trouble to remove the tariff than to change the policies of the Canadian Wheat Board. It would be easier and quicker. Also, it would not cost the western farmer nearly as much.

I do not know where the government thinks it is going with policies of this kind. The Minister of Agriculture says that everything is cozy in the dairy industry. However, it was reported in the paper that another cheese factory east of Ottawa is closing. A group of farmers who were delivering to that cheese factory are now going out of production. I am sure the minister reads the papers, but he still says everything is cozy in the dairy industry.

We have imported butter. When the minister was on his feet, he should have told us what single or collective action this government and the Canadian Dairy Commission took in the past 12 months to ensure sufficient production of butterfat and milk proteins to meet the needs of the Canadian people and any demands for export. He did not tell us that because he and his government have not done a thing. They sit there shivering, worrying about the threat of inflation and fearing that if they give some real incentive to the farmer his production will rise again. Therefore they do not do anything in some of these important areas.

I think the five cents a quart subsidy to the consumer is good. Maybe some day the minister will tell us what the new dairy policy is to ensure the supply of sufficient dairy products for the Canadian people. After the minister meets with the beef people, maybe he can meet with the dairy commission and the dairy people with regard to boosting dairy production.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has now expired.

[Translation]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak on the opposition motion moved by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and which reads as follows:

This House deplores the government's inability to give leadership in developing and implementing comprehensive and co-ordinated agricultural policies and programs and regrets that by ill-advised and *ad hoc* remedies the government has weakened the overall agricultural economy.

Since I do not have much time, hardly twenty minutes, I shall merely develop two points I wish to raise in the House. I heard the minister say that the department was trying to be fair to all parts of Canada and was working for the future of agriculture, but I shall give him examples of the type of justice that our legislation often bring about, not because of its provisions but because of the way they are implemented.

I shall first consider our farm improvement loans legislation. The 28th annual report for the year 1972 has just been published. Here is what it says:

The Farm Improvement Loans Act came into force in March, 1945 for an initial period of three years and was subsequently

Agriculture

amended from time to time to provide additional lending periods and widen its scope of operation.

The purpose of the legislation is to facilitate the availability of intermediate term and short term credit to farmers for the improvement or development of farms and for the improvement of living conditions thereon.

All of this is very nice. The report continues:

The main purposes for which Farm Improvement Loans could be made during the year under review were:

- purchase of agricultural implements, new and used;
- the construction, repair or alteration of farm buildings;
- the purchase of livestock;
- the purchase of additional farm land;
- general works for the improvement . . .

When one reads this report, one becomes aware of discrimination against Quebec farmers. Although the government has been fighting for many years to remove regional disparities, I think that, in the area of agriculture, this bill does not sufficiently take regional disparities into account.

Let us consider loans for instance. On page 10, the heading of Table 3 is the following: "Loans Classified by Provinces and Purposes". For the information of hon. members, British Columbia has granted 1,584 loans; Alberta, 16,992; Saskatchewan, 18,340; Manitoba, 6,146; Ontario 8,703 and Quebec 282.

• (1610)

Mr. Corriveau: The figures for the province of Quebec are not right.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says the figures for the province of Quebec are not right. Never mind that.

An hon. Member: This is true.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): We all know the Farm Credit Corporation of Quebec, and I for one know something about it. Then, neither the federal government nor the Quebec government grant loans to farmers—

An hon. Member: Our farmers are too rich.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Are our farmers too rich? Far from it. Let us examine the situation more closely. Saskatchewan was granted 18,340 loans but only 282 were granted to Quebec. Quebec farmers cannot be indefinitely laughed at. We wonder why they are rebelling. The situation has been going on for 10 years—

Mr. Marcel Roy (Laval): How many applications for loans were made?

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): The member for Laval is asking how many applications were made. I will answer him, because I have done much work in that field; applications were filed, but they were never accepted. Applications are not accepted. That is why I say that the law is good, but that its implementation is bad; I do not know whether that depends on the men in power or the present staff but we still cannot . . . I have been trying for two years now to get a loan for a farmer who has 150 slaughter