

would even be prepared to give them a re-training course on the subject if they will spare time for it.

• (4:10 p.m.)

[English]

**Mr. Jack Bigg (Pembina):** Mr. Speaker, in my opinion we are dealing today with one of the most important bills ever to come before the House of Commons. Agriculture has always been one of the great bulwarks of freedom and I contend it always will be. When there is no freedom in agriculture a disappointed citizen has nowhere to turn when he becomes dissatisfied with his lot in life. This is a basic freedom of man, and has been ever since Adam worked in the Garden. If we take away from the individual the right to till his own land and the right to choose what he will grow, we reduce him to the position of being a vassal of the state. Call slavery by any other name—it still stinks. There is no state so benign, no state so all-knowing that it is entitled to deprive an individual of his right to put in his 70 years on earth the way he wants to. Many a time when I was a soldier, or when I pounded the beat as a policeman, I had in mind the wonderful feeling that some day I could take off my uniform if I wanted to and go back to being my own boss.

Efficiency on the farm is important. I notice that throughout this bill, when other arguments have been exhausted, the word "efficiency" comes in. Clause 22 embodies the overriding purpose of this measure. It is intended to set up a viable agricultural industry in Canada. I claim right from the start that when the individual is ignored no industry can flourish. In fact, when an industry is taken over by the state the state becomes a monster, the individual shrinks and freedom hangs her head in shame. These are strong words, but they do not exaggerate the situation.

Agriculture is facing a problem and governments have a duty to do what they can to assist farmers in their difficulties. We have set up unnecessary trade barriers all over the world, most of them useless, in my opinion. No one government is responsible for this situation. But they exist, and one of our most pressing needs today is to eliminate them. If we were to reduce hunger throughout the world by the distribution of the world's wealth from those nations which have too much—and Canada is one of these—to those which have too little, and there are many—we

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*  
might find a solution to some of the smaller problems; there might be better transportation, better price arrangements, better levels of government support, better help from Ph.D's in agriculture toward the production of cheaper and better food.

But I am not thinking on this world wide scale at the present time; I am directing my attention mainly to Bill C-197 which purports to answer all these questions on the local scene by setting up one big, all-embracing, bureaucratic council to handle all the affairs of agriculture on the basis of its own limited knowledge and dedication. No matter how hard they try, as they sit behind their big mahogany desks with good civil service jobs and the security of a party that may well perpetuate itself in office for many years, they do not consider facets of agriculture that cannot be legislated upon. I am referring to such things as the individual love of the land and the care of the farm home, the care of animals and poultry, which in the final analysis are the market products but which must be cared for from birth through storm, sun, drought, all those things the farmer and his family have to contend with. These are the human things which this legislation entirely ignores.

I see nothing in this bill to guarantee to the producers of this all-important wealth in the world—food—the right to say how and when they will grow their products, how and when they will care for their cattle, and how and when they will market them, what prices they will get, what quantities they are to raise. Under this bill, they become nothing more than faceless tools of the state. I say without hesitation that Bill C-197, put into legislative form, is one of the most potentially dangerous pieces of legislation ever brought before the House of Commons, and I could be party to very little of it. In principle it is wrong, and in execution it is anathema.

For 12 years in this House I have been saying that the farmers should be protected, that some form of licensing might well be needed to protect the farmers against professional people, perhaps even Members of Parliament with their limited incomes, who go into the hog business. I think that the proper place to raise hogs is on the family farm. It is unnecessary to bring in a bill of this sort in order to keep hog production within the family farm where the vast majority of hogs ought to be raised.

Legislation that guarantees a hog quota on the family farm, set experimentally at 100,