

(Mr. Corriveau), I would like to mention how the government is concerned with farmers. During the Liberal convention 19 resolutions were adopted with a view to further improving farmers' conditions. We keep on encouraging young farmers to produce through training, labour retraining, transportation policy and feed grain marketing policy because situations accepted since 1935 will no longer be tolerated. As mentioned by the minister, we no longer want policies aimed at depriving western producers from whatever they are entitled to have; we will demand a fair policy for western producers and eastern grain consumers. We insist on it and we do not want to deprive western grain producers of anything.

In 1969, I visited the western provinces with the members of the committee on agriculture; I think we met 18,000 grain producers. We sympathized with the grain producers who were selling their grain 50¢ a bushel. We saw it on the spot. We sympathized with them and we all agreed that such a situation should be corrected.

And today, we see those very same people criticizing all we have done in the field of the new feed grain policy. And yet western producers were not deprived of anything. It has been said for instance that the grain producer will get a price consistent with the production cost, a price which is competitive in relation to that obtained by eastern producers.

When some hon. members make a speech, I wonder what type of hat they are wearing. Is it a grain producer's hat, a cattle feeder's hat or a protective hat like those of western grain elevator owners? I would like to know once and for all on whose side they are: on the side of the grain elevator owners, of the grain producers, or of the cattlemen or the feeders?

I believe that when we talk about legislation concerning agriculture, we should aim at developing a national agricultural policy instead of a policy which seems better suited to personal interests.

I have no intention of continuing any longer, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to add a comment about the fodder policy, which is very important for eastern producers. As to the differences in prices between eastern and western Canada, we want equal treatment. That is all we want—

[English]

**Mr. Baker:** Speak to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board about it—

[Translation]

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** That is exactly what we are asking for.

Mr. Speaker, if we compare food prices of different countries of the world, Canada appears to be well protected; Canadian consumers can buy higher quality products, healthy and very well classified products at highly competitive prices. Take Japan, for example, where sirloin steak is \$12 a pound.

In view of the current price situation, the consumer became somewhat more sensitive to the problem because agriculture has a role to play and the Department of Agriculture therefore needs more funds which it could use not only to help farmers but also to contribute in keeping consumer prices at a reasonable level.

### Agriculture

In conclusion, I will deal with the question of the marketing board, by appealing to all provinces. If each of them keeps on implementing a provincial marketing policy, they will find that the province of Quebec can produce twice as many broilers and eggs than it does at the present time.

If the provinces have a national marketing board, they must work together, for producers do not wish to experience another situation like that of 1971, when eggs were selling for 23 cents a dozen, and broilers for 16 and 17 cents a pound. In order to prevent such a disaster, I call upon all provinces, all producers to work in close cooperation with the marketing boards, not only at the provincial level but also at the national level. For, if every province keeps on working in isolation, we might experience once again next year the dark days of the chicken and egg "war".

We have today an excellent tool, the National Marketing Board, and if all producers stay alert, production could be doubled. And who would be the first losers? The producers, and in the long term, they would have to pay prohibitive prices for consumer goods, simply because farmers are not interested to produce, since profitability in the field of agriculture can not be compared with investment yields in other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I have concluded my remarks, for it is six o'clock.

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I think there would be agreement that the hon. member be permitted to finish his speech. He would have another two minutes. If he wishes to use that time now, I believe the House would be agreeable because of the long interval we will have this evening. Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** Mr. Speaker, here is my conclusion: I think that it is difficult to compare agriculture with industry because agricultural productivity can in fact be doubled. It is as simple as that. But I think we should adjust agriculture to the consumer market. Consumption does not increase at the same rate as production.

Thus I think we should not minimize the problems of agriculture but consider them objectively, and together we can adjust agriculture both to the domestic consumer market and to exports.

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being 6 p.m., I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m. I would remind the House that at that time we shall take up motions again.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. In accordance with the order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to motions, under routine proceedings.