

The Address—Mr. Patterson

Quebec, I can assure you that the professional farmer's association to which he belongs himself will not take him very seriously, for he takes a stand in parliament but he has another story when he comes before the farmers.

When the hon. member met the members of the C.F.U. in his own constituency, they asked him to demand in Ottawa \$5.10 per hundredweight of manufacturing milk. The hon. member accepted and told them that he would be their spokesman in the Canadian parliament.

Mr. Speaker, who is in a position to determine the minimum price asked by farmers and dairy producers in Canada or in Quebec. Is it the members of the house or rather the experts of the C.F.U. or those working for the Canadian farming association or the dairy producers of Canada?

Mr. Côté (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Caouette: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Côté (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, did the hon. member understand, as the Canadian press did, the statement of the member of Nicolet-Yamaska who asked the representatives of all the political parties to refrain from playing politics with the agricultural class, contrary to what he is now doing? I did not speak against the farmers, but on the contrary I tried to persuade the members of the opposition not to play politics, petty partisan politics with the farmers. And yet, this is what he is now doing.

Mr. Caouette: Precisely, Mr. Speaker, such a foolish statement as the one made by the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska is received with applause. Can one imagine that the member for Nicolet-Yamaska should fear that we play politics with agricultural class when he has never done anything else in his own constituency and the whole province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, those are the people who go about rural areas asking the people's support so that they can make claims on their behalf here in parliament. But when we assert their rights, we are attacked, we are accused of trying to use the farmers for political reasons. The member for Nicolet-Yamaska brought up the matter himself here in the house the day before yesterday.

I ask the member for Nicolet-Yamaska who knows the C.F.U.: who are the people aware of the needs of the farmer? The farmers and

their specialists have stated that \$5.10 per hundredweight of manufacturing milk is the minimum price—minimum and not maximum price—which can enable the farmers to make ends meet.

I meet farmers. I have some in my constituency. I meet some elsewhere in the province and when it is recognized today—the hon. member would be the first to do so if his government were not in power and if he was not a government member—that the farmer barely makes \$1,900 to \$2,250 net per year. That is the farmer's income. Yet, the hon. member is against our giving \$5 or \$5.10 per hundredweight of industrial milk. When I moved an emergency debate on the government's dairy policy the other day, why did the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska not rise at that time to defend the farmers of his own constituency of Nicolet-Yamaska? No, he stays in his seat.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I understand there was some agreement as to the extra time to be given to the hon. member and I must advise him now that his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I shall close my remarks by saying that we clearly maintain our attitude towards agriculture and milk producers. We maintain that Canada can improve its economic, political and social position insofar as everyone co-operates to its improvement. We can make Canada a prosperous country by permitting the provinces to develop according to their own aspirations and by consolidating our unity in the greatest national respect.

[*English*]

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, on taking part in the throne speech debate I would first like to offer my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Jamieson) and seconder (Mr. Côté, Nicolet-Yamaska) of the address in reply. One may not altogether agree with everything that was said by these two gentlemen but I believe they made a contribution to this debate consistent with their convictions and discharged the role assigned to them in a very commendable fashion. The hon. member for Burin-Burgeo presented in a very clear and concise manner many of the views and convictions I had intended to stress during the course of this debate. But even though it may be somewhat