

Agricultural Stabilization Act

ments to decide whether we are to go into this tripartite agreement and stop subsidization, or we are going to keep subsidization and take the chance of losing our markets. We cannot go on with subsidization and still have our markets in other parts of the world, because that subsidization will be resented in the same way as we resent the subsidization of European beef. The bottom line is that producers in every province must be treated fairly and equitably with special favours to none. Alberta producers want to stand on their own feet. They want fair competition because they cannot compete against government subsidies.

● (1800)

I think one would find that the farmers and producers in every province say the same thing. They want fair treatment. Keeping Canada together is important. I am sure in the minds of most Canadians when they elected this Government was the thought that we would try to keep Canada together. The Progressive Conservatives were the last hope of many people in this country. When this Bill is passed it will be demonstrated to all Canadians and to the world that we want to be fair to every part of Canada and keep all of Canada together.

I want the producers of every province to be able to compete and produce fairly and equitably. I want the beef and pork producers of Alberta to have an opportunity to survive, grow and contribute to a prosperous and united nation, and I want the same for every other province and every other producer. If this administration fails to accomplish that, then we can still do something different—at least we are trying. I have no intention of stopping an effort by saying it has failed before it has even started.

The red meat industry is important to me, to the Minister, to the people of Alberta and to all of Canada. I am sure that the goal of fair treatment will be accomplished.

We are a trading nation, an exporting nation. We cannot afford to lose our markets. Agriculture must decide whether to exist with its government subsidies and lose its market or forego government subsidy and live good and increasing markets. That is what I hope this Bill will accomplish. No subsidies, provincially or federally, will invoke fair trade in this country. We want to show other parts of the world that we are not asking our produces to compete against government money.

International law must not be used as a back door to come in and destroy some of our industries. So I also urge the Government to take a look at these international laws and GATT agreements so we will not have unfair treatment to our agricultural industry in any part of Canada. That has been too evident in the past.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill may not be perfect but it will give Canadians a chance. It will give the whole industry, including the beef and pork producers in every province, an opportunity to grow and prosper and to contribute to a greater and better Canada and to a better world.

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear the speech by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). His eloquent defence of Canada as a nation was very interesting but hardly appropriate, since he was talking about unity in connection with a Bill that is so divisive and on which it has been impossible to get any consensus. Telegrams are pouring in for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise), announcing that most intervenors are against the Bill. When the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) talks about national unity and Canada's great virtues as a nation, he should realize that this measure has divided the Canadian agricultural community more than ever. I think the Hon. Member would be doing farmers a favour if he recognized this country's diversity as well as its unity.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Bill is a mistake in that it fails to recognize the diversity of this country and of Canadian agriculture. The Hon. Member gave an example of a situation in his province. I have a great deal of respect for his province, but the practice there is entirely different from the situation in other provinces. Of course he sees the Bill as an advantage since there is no such program in his province, but, and he said this earlier, there are other farmers who already have vested interests. There are farms across the country, in other provinces, who have made sacrifices to set up stabilization programs. There are provincial governments that have already made sacrifices and have used some of their resources to set up a stabilization instrument.

The Hon. Member refuses to admit that not all Canadian provinces are in the same situation. Nor will the Minister admit it, and that is why there is so much concern about this Bill.

The Minister is oblivious of the fact that for several days, Quebec farmers have been going from Member's office to Member's office, trying to persuade Members to stop the Minister and tell him: We need more consultation and more guarantees. And up to now, the Minister has refused to listen. He was at the committee sitting when the UPA president was there with representatives from other federations, but I wonder whether he was really listening, because none of their representations were incorporated in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister will have to recognize that there is disagreement on this Bill. He will have to, and I am thinking of the editorial in "*Terre de chez nous*", where François Côté says: "Instead of taking a vigorous stand against this manoeuvre, the Canadian Government seems to want to use it as an excuse to justify the adoption of Bill C-25. It is a constraint that is unacceptable for two reasons." And then we get comments on the pork issue, and I will get back to that later. Mr. Côté goes on to say: "Adopting Bill C-25 would mean adopting institutionalized hypocrisy, because from the strictly economic point of view, increasing income or reducing costs produces exactly the same results".