

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

I regret that we cannot go on to clause 2, which concerns me much more than anything I shall have to say in a general way in respect of clause 1. I mention clause 2 because it deals with cattle and calves, all live-stock, and this is a commodity which involves the income of half the people in the constituency I represent in this House of Commons. With that introduction might I say the Conservative party has always supported the establishment of marketing boards—

**Mr. Benjamin:** Baloney!

**Mr. McIntosh:** —which will provide all producers with fair access to markets. The history of the establishment of the Canadian Wheat Board should make such a statement abundantly clear even to some of the members of the New Democratic Party.

**An hon. Member:** Don't worry about it, Jack. We've been around.

**Mr. McIntosh:** I will have more to say to you in a few moments.

**An hon. Member:** All right; I'll come back.

**Mr. McIntosh:** Don't go away. Mr. Speaker, we have been asked why we oppose Bill C-176 in its present form. The answer, of course, is that we believe this bill will permit the removal of the protection afforded consumers as well as producers by the judicial and constitutional assurance of free access to other markets and other products, and will place in its stead the possibility of decisions motivated purely by local political considerations as have been espoused by some members to my left.

By evading the economic discipline of the free market, Bill C-176 invites political overtones in Canadian agriculture and places the destiny of the industry in the arena of power politics. The difference in our policy from that of the Liberals or the NDP is that we believe marketing boards should assist the industry and not control the industry, as some of my colleagues to the left have so often suggested and yet they believe they have the right to say they support the farming industry.

We have three main objections to this bill. There are several other minor objections such as the jail term, which I understand now is changed so that there will be a fine of \$5,000. Then there are the powers of the inspectors—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I think in fairness I must suggest to the hon. member, as I did to the hon. member for Fraser Valley East, that at this stage of our proceedings the debate is on the motion before us. With respect, I think the hon. member may be slightly outside the motion and I would ask him, as I asked the hon. member for Fraser Valley East, to keep within the confines of relevancy with regard to this motion.

**An hon. Member:** He wouldn't know how.

**Mr. McIntosh:** Mr. Speaker, with all deference to you I would say from reading the speeches which have already been delivered on this part of the bill that I am following closely what has been allowed. There are three main

[Mr. McIntosh.]

reasons why we object to the bill. We have maintained from the very start that it would control production.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Is that so?

**Mr. McIntosh:** I should like to say to my NDP colleague that he feels pretty cocky tonight and I presume it is because of the Saskatchewan election. Let me tell him that they were wiped out of office in 1958 by the same people who have now put them in, and the people of Saskatchewan will do it again.

**Mr. Benjamin:** By the Conservatives?

**Mr. McIntosh:** It could be by the Conservatives or by the Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, I said there are three main reasons why we object to this bill. We object because it will control production. We object because there will be no producer participation. Those who were members of the committee will say that this has been changed. It has been changed to the extent that while in the first place the appointees were all bureaucrats, the committee was successful in having 50 per cent of the appointees producer representatives. The minister was very wise to give in to the members of the committee in this manner because they swallowed it hook, line and sinker, including the members of the NDP, because once these representatives of the agricultural industry are on the board they will be there only at the pleasure of the minister. If the minister should not like any answer given by the representatives on the board he could at his pleasure take them off. To my mind that is not producer representation.

Only today, I believe, all members of the House of Commons received from the Atlantic Dairy Council a letter of protest about the action some bureaucrats take when they have supreme power over an industry. I do not think it is necessary to read all the letter but I should like to read part of it in order to explain what I mean by bureaucratic dictatorship. Part of the letter reads:

We strongly object, however, to the drafting of regulations under Bill C-180 which appear to serve the purposes of restricting and harassing industry and providing employment for bureaucrats, but which do not in any way relate to the best interests of consumers.

Up to now standards were set by the Food and Drug Directorate for such foods as ice cream. The consumer was amply protected and secure in the knowledge that ice cream was being tested by food and drug inspectors to make certain that the product met the standards. Now it appears that it will be necessary to list all the ingredients in descending order of proportion, in English and in French. It is even suggested that the net contents of the package will have to be stated either in cubic centimeters or millilitres, in some cases to two places of decimals.

This, of course, is a clear case of bureaucracy gone mad. The interests of Canadian consumers will not be served by this type of nonsensical, restrictive legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with that statement. The third main reason why we object to this bill is that there is no opportunity for any branch of the agricultural industry to opt into any marketing scheme or to opt out if they so want. As I said, we have nothing against marketing boards so long as they are intended to assist the industry, so long as there is no compulsion and no control of production.