

that production is the purpose of man. I ask: Efficiency for what, and in relation to whom? Efficiency for the machine, or efficiency in relation to the man whom the machine is supposed to serve? The instrumentality of the state can and must be employed to give intelligent direction to the forces of technology and economics, to so shape them that they once again serve man.

I should like to quote Mr. Goodman once again in this respect. He said:

Urbanization is not a necessity of technology. On the contrary, the thrust of modern technology, for example, electricity, power tools, automobiles, long distance communication and automation, would seem to be disurbanization, dispersal of population and industry.

Mr. Goodman goes on to say that this was the thinking of Marx and Engels, Kropotkin, Patrick Geddes, Frank Lloyd Wright and other enthusiasts of scientific technology. He continues with this remark:

Urbanization is mainly due not to natural or social-psychological causes, but to political policy and an economic style careless of social costs and even money costs.

A few moments ago I said that Canada has never had an agricultural policy worthy of the name. The reason is that we have always had governments which have conceived their role as being regulative rather than creative. Confronted by change, they have simply reacted, usually too late and only after their unbridled effects have created a crisis atmosphere, to regulate against the most obvious and adverse effects of change. Our national governments have never really looked upon change as an opportunity, although they invariably have given lip service to this concept. Rather, they have without exception reacted to change as though it is necessarily disruptive. Our federal governments have never consistently seized the opportunities represented by change and harnessed and directed them toward shaping the kind of society in which we would like to live.

That is why federal legislation has never had any discernible pattern to it and no inherent logic. Federal legislation is almost invariably a panic response to a crisis situation. That is why our statutes, rather than resembling a closely-woven tapestry resemble an ill-made crazy quilt. That is why we in the New Democratic Party have feelings about this bill which can only be described as ambiguous. We approve of the concept of national marketing boards because of the power they are capable of giving to the

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

farmer in the marketplace. We approve of this concept within the context of underpinning or upgrading the family farm and within the context of restoring vitality to our dying rural communities. But this government has not seen fit to place the legislation in that context. We do not know whether the government has the same idea for the use of this legislation as we have, or whether it intends to use the legislation to speed the trend toward a rural Canada characterized by ghost towns and vast, unpopulated fields.

In order to receive the answers to some of the questions I have posed in these brief remarks this evening our caucus has determined that we will support this bill on second reading. It is in order, also, to be able to make the kind of concrete effective amendments that will ensure that the purpose we wish to see this legislation serve is served, that we will allow this legislation to go before a committee. We are in wholehearted agreement with the major portion of the amendment presented to this House by the official opposition, but we cannot see our way clear to vote with the official opposition in support of the amendment, despite our belief that producers must be represented on the council and the marketing agencies as of right.

● (8:50 p.m.)

We cannot vote with the official opposition, because voting with them will have the result of effectively destroying the bill with its potential for good. Rather than do that, we will support the bill on second reading so that it may go before committee where we can present amendments which will ensure that producers are represented on the council and the agencies allied to the council as of right; in order to ensure that the legislation will be used for an appropriate purpose.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I must at once say that we have no ambiguous view as to this bill and the amendment which has been placed before the House by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). If we had any illusions about this government, if we had any reason to believe it was a government which was flexible enough, sincere enough and sufficiently dedicated to the interests of the farming community to listen to sound, solid, good amendments which are desperately required to make this bill operate, we would not have moved the amendment and would vote to send the bill to committee following second reading. But, Mr. Speaker, we have had