

and shiftless proletariat, in a word, a seed of revolution and a socialist. That seems to be what the government wants.

I continue the quotation:

The small public charity allowance paid to him is less pitiful than the income he earned when slaving away from dawn to dusk, seven days a week, 52 weeks a year.

This is going on while hundreds of thousands of poverty-stricken people never set eyes on dairy products in the filthy slums in which they live, and while the workers are crushed by the burden of taxes, debts and usurious interest rates paid to unscrupulous bankers.

I consider that this situation has lasted much too long. On the whole, Bill C-197 means total regimentation, balkanization of the various areas of Canada, as if there were boundaries between the provinces.

In introducing Bill C-197, this government is overstepping its role in the field of agriculture. The programs should be administered by farming organizations and not by public servants. A government should just help out by co-ordinating the various efforts, and not exercise a dictatorial and totalitarian control. This bill runs counter to individual freedom since it grants abusive powers to the various offices supervising, administration, delivery of permits and marketing by means of rules and regulations and through their production inspectors.

Furthermore, it will not be the government that will finance the administration of these agencies, but the producers themselves, who will be taxed in that respect. As a matter of fact, according to the provisions of this bill, the government provides only \$100,000 for its financing. Producers will pay to be controlled, and to have the government master their own industry.

Today in Canada, milk and wheat are regulated in the same manner as proposed by the minister for other products, according to Bill C-197. Now, what is the present policy in this respect, and what are its results?

Before giving our consent to Bill C-197, we must conscientiously ask ourselves whether such a policy is in existence today in Canada, and if so, what are its results. If the results are good, I would be inclined to think that this bill could be of some value, but the Canadian experience and that of many other countries show that such a measure of control and balkanization of certain areas in Canada, not only prevents us from controlling production, even if Bill C-197 is passed, but that in addition, we will not solve to any greater extent the problem of the consumer. We will

not have improved the situation. There will still be a superabundance of products on the shelves, and hardship and poverty will prevail in our Quebec families, as well as in the rest of the country.

Injustices will continue just the same, in spite of the denial of the members opposite, because this bill will certainly not cope with the present Canadian problems.

Mr. Speaker, according to the members opposite, there is in this country an overproduction of milk and wheat. At the same time, we of the Ralliement créditiste maintain that it is not a problem of overproduction, but of underconsumption. As for the government, it proposes a bill which provides that, through a marketing program, we will ensure the marketing of production, in order to absorb overproduction.

Indeed, that is what the government really wants. With this principle, Mr. Speaker, I am fully in agreement. Nobody produces for the sake of producing and production does only makes sense in relation to consumption. Even the consumer who is not involved in production because he is disabled, blind, handicapped, on social welfare, or unemployed, must also have his share of the Canadian production. So no matter which kind of marketing system is available as long as we do not provide every Canadian citizen with the means to achieve production, if the consumer is unable to have access to production, we shall never solve the problem of poverty.

● (5:10 p.m.)

Personally, I favor marketing. However, if the program of the government is to be effective, interesting and economic, we must give each Canadian his share of the production and thus make it possible for him to participate. If the parliamentary secretary had more grey matter inside his skull, he would not have spoken such nonsense to the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) and the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe) a moment ago. He showed once more that he does not even begin to understand the Créditiste proposal.

We are not against the bill just for the sake of being against it. We want to oppose it in a constructive and positive way while pointing out that the principle of marketing as far as production is concerned is sheer nonsense. Indeed, at the present time, marketing is not controlled by the government, but by several agencies taking advantage of the producer and the consumer. We must set things right.