

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

We are just arguing to pass a bill whereby producers, if they want, can have this type of organization. The hon. member is saying it should not include hogs. That is fine, but it does not have anything to do with the bill.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member, of course, is arguing a point. The hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. McCutcheon) has the floor.

Mr. McCutcheon: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I sat patiently and listened to the inane chatter of the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCutcheon: I had the courtesy not to interrupt even though it was stupid gobbledegook he was putting forth.

Mr. Paproski: The devil's advocate.

Mr. McCutcheon: I wish to quote a few more figures before I get to my main point. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, in 1940 cattle were \$6.35 and hogs \$11.15. In 1950 cattle were \$23.10 and hogs \$28.75. In 1960 cattle were \$20.87 and hogs \$24.14. The member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand) said that was underpricing them, without a marketing board. The point is that today cattle are 24 cents, 36 cents and 38 cents a pound.

To return to the comments of the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton, I ask this question: Why in the name of heaven would any cattleman want to be covered by this bill? That is the point. If that is not relevant, I do not know what is. I mentioned the fact that with supply management and the closed-shop factor there is no opportunity for young people to get into the business. I commend the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) for saying that what this government wants to do is industrialize agriculture and get rid of farmers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCutcheon: When we talk about supply management we are talking about quotas. The only people who benefit from a quota system are those who get it in the first instance. When the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Lind) goes back to his lumber yard he will want to take this into consideration. From then on it is the cost of production. Last week the commission looking into the problems of egg producers held a meeting in his city. I quote from the transcript what Mr. Littlejohn, a poultry producer, said about supply management at the meeting in London, Ontario:

This year two tobacco producers that I know well and who both live less than 3 miles from me rented their acreages for the year. The one got \$400 per acre and the other \$475.

There is an added cost of production. What are you going to say to the consumer who will be faced with an increased cost? The poultry producers have been talking about this quota all over the province of Ontario. The lumber companies, poultry producers and millers have been constructing henhouses as though they were going out of style. Why? They want to get a tremendous quota because they know it is saleable. They are talking about \$2 or \$3 a hen for a marketable quota.

[Mr. McBride.]

Mr. Paproski: Now we know.

Mr. McCutcheon: Yes, now you know. My third point is that nowhere in this bill do we have effective machinery to limit the importation of foreign products. We are being asked to pass another Bill C-259 on good will. The minister said he will be bringing in amendments to the tax bill after it has been tried out on the Canadian people. The government wants to do the same with this bill.

An hon. Member: Experiment.

Mr. McCutcheon: Yes, experiment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. I do so to advise him that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McCutcheon: I feel very humble and grateful that my colleagues have allowed me to continue. I promise I shall not be long. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) said in 1970 when introducing Bill C-197 that the situation regarding the marketing of foreign products in Canada makes it at least desirable, if not essential, that we have enabling legislation on the statute books, that is, authority from Parliament for the government to respond from time to time to the requests of a substantial number of producers in this field if they are being hurt by foreign imports.

I mentioned the fact that consumers will very likely have to pay more. I come to my final point. Why all the rush? An inquiry into egg marketing is presently being held in the province of Ontario. Their report will be completed soon. Therefore, I submit it is an affront to the producers of the province of Ontario that at this time we in the House are being asked to ram this bill through.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCutcheon: Yesterday the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton said that farmers in his area are hard-pressed. He has no corner on this market. I come from one of the supposedly better agricultural areas in the province of Ontario. The farmers in my area are crying the same blues. They are desperate and despondent. They are saying, "Well, let's give it a try." I am reminded of what a world traveller said in 1949 or 1950. He had just returned from China. They had thrown out Chiang Kai-shek and had accepted communism. He said that the people of China had accepted communism because they felt nothing could be worse than what they had. This is the attitude of the agricultural industry in Canada today. They feel nothing could be worse than what they have. They are grasping at straws. I tell them that this bill is certainly no solution.

In conclusion I point out that the government's advice to agriculture over the years does not cause me to have great faith in the bureaucratic decision-making that this bill will substitute for hard-nosed decision-making of the workaday world. A year ago the government said, "Grow bar-