Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

We are considering amendments to the bill and the bill itself. Primary industry, like all others, has to cope with overproduction and not consumption problems. People do not know what to do with their products.

For Western producers, there is too much grain and too much beef and they embark on other kinds of production like bacon and chicken, but that hampers the Eastern producers' market. In order to get better loan guarantees, we ask for the nationalization of farm products by means of regulations controlling production, sales, price marketing, in short, all the agricultural economy. That causes the Eastern producer to invervene and force the government to establish controlling agencies and penalize Western producers. Shall we find solutions in such proposals or such positions?

Will that prevent prices from going up? Will that enable consumers to consume more? Does that policy recognize that the one who will really control the economy is the one who has the last say, namely the consumer? Do we recognize that production has but one objective, that of meeting peoples' needs? No thought is given to satisfying finance to the detriment of everyone else, everything else.

If agricultural production is to be maintained, as in other sectors, the purchasing power of the consumer must be capable of absorbing even more goods of all sorts. His purchasing power must be supported in proportion with his legitimate needs.

This can be achieved in various ways. First of all, through a compensated discount and through issues of converted credit allowing lower prices. Prices are too high and consumers are therefore prevented from consuming more. This also harms exports.

With regard to the basic industry, agriculture, a discount should be allowed on the purchase of all machinery used in production, on building materials, and products used for transport. This would result in a general lowering of prices, and it would then be easier for the farmers to sell their products. Exports would then also be greatly promoted. Once requirements are met, any surplus should be stored by farmers and their co-operatives for export purposes. The government should use some of it to make gifts, to distribute food for which there is such a great demand in starving countries.

## • (4:50 p.m.)

We do not know what to do with production. Yet, two out of four people in the whole world are starving. We do not know what to do. The lands are put to rest. Farmers are paid not to plant. All kinds of formulas are developped to bother farmers, to prevent them from sowing and producing, to force them to quit so as to produce less and not get surplusses because we are too stupid to distribute the surplusses.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

## An hon. Member: Go on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member may get the unanimous consent to continue his remarks. Is there such consent?

## Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

**Mr.** Latulippe: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members for the kindness that they have shown me. I admit that I have a lot to say, but I shall limit my remarks.

To get back to the Board of commodity control and credit to cooperatives, I was saying that this would assist farmers. If they already have all these types of cooperatives and marketing, they do not need other agencies for marketing. What they need, Mr. Speaker, is some guarantee for the consumer of an adequate purchasing power. In this way, farmers would remain the owners of their farms. Unfortunately, the agencies created and dominated by the government will take all the decisions regarding goods to be produced, quantities, quality, categories and classes of products prices to be paid. In this way, we will have an agricultural economy similar to that of the USSR, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. I would point out that all workshops came to the same conclusions during the Congress on Agriculture: they all concluded against state intervention in agriculture most of them restricted themselves to wish for intervention between the provisions of the second and the third paragraph, that is, between average and high intervention.

At the present time, intervention is directed toward level II, but Bill C-176 does away with level II to fall to level IV. The next step will be complete state control of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, if farmers want more security, they will have to give up a certain degree of freedom, with this Bill C-176. If farmers want a guaranteed annual income and investment benefits, they cannot have high benefits. If farmers want state control, they must cater to the needs of the consumers and the taxpayers. If they want a high level of state control, their organizations will have to transfer a considerable amount of their power, initiative and responsibility to the government. That is the purpose of Bill C-176.

It is hard, if not impossible, to reconcile fundamentally opposed choices. In other terms, it is just about impossible to enjoy the privileges of a system without at the same time accepting its drawbacks.

Because of the increasing interdependence of various fields—those, for instance, of commodities, of wheat, of grains, of fodder plants, of cattle—the whole system has to be integrated in a logical way. This is why I feel, Mr. Speaker—I think that hon. members have already understood—that we cannot approve this bill, for we are fighting for freedom. We are fighting for security, true, but also for freedom, and for this reason we will vote against the bill.

Mr. Roy (Laval): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The hon. member for Laval is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Roy (Laval): Mr. Speaker, I listened most religiously to the speech of the créditiste member for Compton, and I would like to ask him whether there is any other means of promoting orderly production. The hon. member said that the problem was one of price and that the price of farm products was too high—