

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

rural communities which are dependent upon agriculture is less than in industrialized areas or urban communities.

It also talks of the fact that health facilities are fewer in the rural communities and that the doctor-population ratio is less. In other words, there are fewer doctors available to the agricultural, rural communities than to the industrialized communities or the cities. It mentions that the availability and quality of educational facilities are less in the rural community for farmers and agricultural people than in cities and industrialized sectors of the economy. It points out that housing is poorer, that health standards are poorer and that sewage facilities, water facilities and the whole range of social amenities available to Canadians as a whole are denied the agricultural and rural communities. These are denied partly because of the industrialized orientation of the government and partly because of the policy decision of the government to reduce the number of farm families and to encourage the exodus of people from rural communities into the cities.

That is a pretty sad commentary. I submit it is the sort of thing that so far has been the reason for the amendments before the House at report stage of this bill. This I believe, has been ignored so far. The Department of Regional Economic Expansion has available to it hundreds of millions of dollars to give away to industries and corporations, two-thirds of which are United States-dominated, to develop industry and expand industrial plants, but is doing absolutely nothing in the area of rural life.

I submit that the Department of Agriculture should make a policy decision that it is in the interest of Canada to assist farmers to live comfortably off the land, that it is in the interest of Canada to develop a viable agricultural structure and not an industrialized structure. It should develop a type of structure which would make it worth while for farmers to farm and give them the inner feeling that that is the type of life they should lead.

Even though I am a strong supporter of the concept of marketing boards and agencies to ease the economic ups and downs which exist in respect of prices and production of agricultural products, I am rather sceptical that this bill will in fact do what those of us who support marketing boards hope it will do. I am sceptical because of the attitude of the government toward industrial productivity in this nation and a minimization of agricultural activity. Evidently the emphasis of the government is toward city life and manufacturing plants.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member because his time has expired. He may continue with the consent of the House. Is there such agreement?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, as a final paragraph I might say, as I started off, that I do not from my own background in working life have experience as a farmer or of a farming community, as is the case with many members of this House, but I have attempted to draw in my mind, in an attempt to understand what the bill seeks to do, a parallel between the fishing industry with which I am familiar and the farming industry. I submit that there is a parallel, that each is a prime producer, that each is involved in the harvesting of foodstuffs and in the mar-

keting of them to a greater or lesser degree. Each runs into the cost-price squeeze and neither is in a position to deal adequately with inflation. What makes me sceptical about the relationship of the bill to the family farm is the fact that this government has taken similar action with respect to its fisheries policy.

• (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member. There is no limit on the extended time which he is allowed and he can speak much longer if he wishes to do so, but I have some doubts whether at least parts of the speech he is now making are within the terms of the motions before us. It seems to me that the approach of the hon. member is in relation to the principle of the bill itself, rather than to the principle of the motions now before us. In the time remaining at the hon. member's disposal he might relate his remarks to the motions under consideration.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** I thought that in the earlier part of the remarks I had followed precisely the scope that was available to hon. members who spoke yesterday when, of course, Your Honour was not in the chair. I was simply trying to follow the tenor of that debate. I admit that speaking about fisheries is somewhat far afield from a national farm products marketing bill and the amendments that are before us.

In summation and in conclusion I was trying to draw a parallel with the fishing industry. This government, without regard to the effect of some of our coastal communities, because of its attitude with respect to fisheries on the west coast has driven some of our coastal communities 95 per cent into the hands of the welfare agencies. There is nothing available to these people as prime producers because the government itself set the course which has driven fishermen out of the fishing industry. That is why I am sceptical and believe that the concept of this bill is designed to drive farmers out of agricultural life and into industrial life. Farmers are having to move into the cities owned by Kraft, by General Foods or by other massive organizations which seem to want to control the agricultural industry.

That is why I am sceptical about the effect this piece of legislation will have on the agricultural community. That is undoubtedly why those who will be affected by it, farmers in various fields of production, are also sceptical about it and are of divided opinion, because some of them can see the day coming when they will be out of business, unable to find employment in industry and on the welfare rolls. Surely that is not what we should be talking about in the House.

**Mr. J. G. Lind (Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege to speak on Bill C-176, the national farm products marketing bill. As one who is an active farmer in the constituency of Middlesex, I say at the outset that I have enjoyed the privileges extended under three of the Ontario farm marketing boards. We all recognize that farmers as a general rule are rather independent people who rely on their own resources and initiative to make a "go" of farming. We realize that in the very competitive society in which we live some farmers need legislation to protect them. The well-to-do, prosperous farmers may not