

the task force which was submitted to the Congress on Agriculture. I am reading from the official document:

Supply management of the all-pervasive type which would be in a position to allocate resources rationally, would have to include most farm products, would involve inspection, research, administration and control far exceeding anything that we have experienced in Canadian agriculture to date.

It goes on to say, and this is important:

Such an extreme should be avoided at all costs if reasonably satisfactory alternatives exist.

And it concludes by saying:

Fortunately there are alternatives, which, though not fully satisfactory should be given every opportunity before launching the "ultimate weapon" of supply management.

That is not all, Mr. Speaker. I would like to quote from some statements made by Secretary Freeman, former Secretary of Agriculture in the United States. The United States tried this idea. There is nothing new in supply management. There is nothing new in government control of supply management, but the United States learned a bitter lesson. I would like to quote from part of a speech by Secretary Freeman, to be found in "Successful Farming" of June, 1963:

Only about one-fourth of our farm income is from commodities for which both production and pricing decisions have been relinquished by the individual to central authority. This includes wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts and tobacco. Yet this 25 per cent of agriculture accounts for about 75 per cent of farm program costs, 85 per cent of the accumulated stocks, and 95 per cent of the controversy.

He went on:

For two years the Administration made strong efforts to impose or extend mandatory controls to feed grains, dairy products, turkeys, broilers, and potatoes. These drives were made from deep conviction and with abundant willingness to spend public money—by a political party in firm control of both the Congress and the White House. None of these drives succeeded!

The new farm policy proposals by the administration have been few rather than many and voluntary rather than mandatory.

• (3:30 p.m.)

It has been tried and it is a failure, yet we in this country are being asked to pass a bill to set up government control of supply. That is why we take a dim view of this legislation and the power it gives to the government. We do not think it can succeed.

Experience shows that the agricultural industry in Canada is in balance. Wherever something checks the free flow of primary agricultural product, there is a natural and an economic tendency to diversify into some-

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

thing more lucrative. Governmental control on one primary commodity brings about a shift to another commodity, which in turn means a further shift to another commodity and so on ad infinitum. This is why the task force report emphasizes that supply management cannot succeed unless there is government control over all the main primary products in agriculture today. But Mr. Speaker, this is not what the industry wants; it does not want to be fenced in. What primary producers want is greater emphasis on markets, particularly in the international field, not a cutback to satisfy our domestic markets in a shrinking international field. This is not competition. This is throwing in the sponge.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Danforth: What would be the effect on agriculture if all the powers the government requests in this bill were implemented? Maybe the government will never use these powers, but we have to assume there is an intention to use them. We, in the opposition, must deal with the bill on that basis.

It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill is implemented in its present form not only the agriculture industry but the allied industries, the chemical plants, packing plants, distribution and processing plants will be reduced to the status of public utilities working on government directive only.

Mr. Hees: For shame.

Mr. Danforth: The minister indicated that the National Dairy Commission was a prime example of what could be accomplished.

An hon. Member: Heaven forbid!

Mr. Danforth: Although the appointees to this commission were supposed to represent the producers of the nation, in the actual fact they turned out to be public relations representatives of the government, selling government policy to the producers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Danforth: If one thinks that a commission of this kind is going to be effective for the primary producers, one only has to look back to the time when the minister indicated to the industry that there would be a \$10 million cutback, and that they should cut their coat according to their cloth.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Danforth: That is not misrepresentation from the industry, that is regimentation by