

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

By its actions this government seems bent on eliminating as many farmers as possible. Indeed, I would go further and say that by their actions they intend to eliminate as many rural communities as possible in order that a computerized, central establishment will have complete control of all agricultural production, its volume, origin and sale.

Karl Marx, in his famous manifesto, summarized the first steps necessary for the creation of state control as follows:

1. Abolition of property in land, and the application of all rents of land to public purpose.
2. A heavy and progressive tax on income.
3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Bill C-197 is one more mile on the road to statism, perhaps the last mile.

If the minister is sincere in his statements to the farm organizations with regard to producer control, he should withdraw this bill and have it redrafted. If he does not withdraw the bill, then the credibility of what he is saying about producer participation is open to question, for nowhere in this bill is there any suggestion that the farmers and their organizations will have any control whatsoever of the licensing, production and sale of their products. They will be nothing more than puppets in the hands of a government bureaucracy.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, in participating in this debate on Bill C-197 I have no hesitation in supporting the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). In my opinion this is the crux of the whole situation. If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) was truly concerned about representation on the marketing board, he would accept this motion and the House could get on with other business. In the amendment of the hon. member for Crowfoot it is suggested that there be representation from those people actually involved in the production of the products spelled out in the bill.

Our party is and has always been in favour of a national marketing board to control and supervise the markets of the agricultural producers. We have always been in favour of the Canadian Wheat Board. Our party supports this board, even though I have reason to suspect that some ministers and members on the government side are trying to defame the Canadian Wheat Board and form other institutions to take its place. Our party is in favour of orderly marketing in all its phases,

particularly the marketing of feed grains. In introducing the bill at this time the minister is suggesting to the members of the House that he is not in favour of this bill, if we use the analogy of feed grains. I have yet to hear the minister say in this House that he is in favour of the orderly marketing of feed grains as advocated by all farm groups. Many members and many Canadians generally are very concerned about the lack of implementation of those things which mean something to the Canadian people. I refer to the fact that produce other than that spelled out in this bill is not really regulated. The produce that is regulated is being sold at fire-sale prices without much concern by the minister.

As the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) said on April 28, the farmer will be little more than the hired man of the agency if farmers are not allowed to be council members and take part in decision-making. The amendment of the hon. member for Crowfoot spells out the exact position of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar. If there was representation on a marketing board in the way there should be, there is no reason why our party would not support the bill now before us. If one looks at the facts they will know why we are suspicious of this bill. Clause 3(1) of the bill reads:

There shall be a council to be known as the National Farm Products Marketing Council consisting of not less than three and not more than nine members to be appointed by the Governor in Council to hold office during pleasure.

In his opening remarks on the subject of the national marketing agency on March 17, the minister referred to the creation of a National Farm Products Marketing Council. When referring to that council he suggested that the producers supported this policy all the way. Possibly three or four years ago most producers in this country would have supported a national farm marketing agency to control all areas of production, but I suggest to the minister that things have changed today. In the eyes of the producers today, the government is suspect. Canadian producers are suspicious about this government having complete control of their marketing. They have reason to be suspicious.

As I have said, this party supports the Canadian Wheat Board. When reading the minister's statements in various publications we wonder whether he is concerned about any type of marketing board. I realize that the Minister of Agriculture comes from a livestock-producing area and may not be concerned about the orderly marketing of feed