(Mr. Pringle), though I would add that I agree with some of his opinions on vertical integration.

No one can deny the need for marketing agencies to handle the produce of half a million farms spread over a vast area embracing millions of square miles. But we wonder whether in this legislation we are discussing state control rather than marketing boards. The bill proposes to take control out of the hands of the primary producer and provincial bodies and place it in the hands of government appointed bureaucrats. What guarantee have we that all areas of agriculture and all sections of the country will be represented by these appointees? Does this not suggest some shocking possibilities, such as the favouring of some areas of the country over others? I will deal with this question further in regard to the Dairy Commission.

Although the bill mentions the interests of the consumer, no examples are given of how the consumer will benefit. I failed to find any mention of specific benefits to the primary producer in my study of the bill. On different occasions the minister has talked about "consensus" and about the "requests made by a substantial majority of producers" for marketing boards. But I should like to ask what relation Bill C-197 has to this particular concept.

After an initial grant from the government for the purpose of establishing such an agency, the producer will be required to pay for maintenance of that agency. With the rigid controls that will be placed on his production, the farmer will be uneasy, to say the least, about the benefits, if any, that he is going to derive from this legislation. His profits are dwindling now, and this is but one other expense added to many. It is something like buying a pig in a poke.

Cannot you picture, Mr. Speaker, the farmer, who is one of the most independent operators to be found anywhere—I might add he has not much left but his independence—reacting to the added chore of keeping the records that are required by this agency, to be submitted to them on request? What about his reaction to having an inspector prying into the sale of every item? I shudder to think of the cost, paid by the farmer, of hiring enough inspectors to police every farm in Canada. Considering the mood of today's farmer, he may well ask whether he will also be asked to contribute to the cost of building more jails to house those farmers who, inadvertently or otherwise, fail to come to heel and may be required to spend two years in jail to bring to their attention the fact that this is not a free country after all.

As an example of this type of legislation—and this surely cannot be regarded as a hypothetical one—let me refer to the Canadian Dairy Commission. When it was formed in 1966 it seemed an innocent enough body, set up to handle dairy products and related problems and to pay subsidies where subsidies were required. For the record, I may say the commissioners were top-flight men. They were co-operative in every way, and I mean no criticism of them by any of my remarks tonight. However, the commission set limits on production or quotas for subsidy payments on manufacturing milk. Aside from an upper limit, a producer had to produce so much per year or no subsidy would be paid. When a dairy herd was dispersed, if the quota attached reverted to the commission it could be reallocated or not, as the Dairy Commission wished.

The next step was to subtract all costs involved in exporting milk surpluses from the amount of money voted for the payment of subsidies. A hold back of 26 cents from the $1.25 subsidy per 100 pounds of 3.5 per cent milk left a subsidy of 99 cents a hundredweight. On all over-quota production, the holdback was doubled to 56 cents a hundredweight. This year the holdback on overproduction has been increased to $1.25 a hundredweight. In addition to this, the government is now seeking provincial co-operation to get control of the fluid milk business so that it might place a levy of $1.25 a hundredweight on all surplus milk produced by fluid milk shippers. As most fluid milk quotas are small in relation to total production, this would, if allowed to take place, put many producers out of business immediately. If anyone thinks this is not so, they should, as I have, talk to these fluid milk shippers. Since fluid milk shippers are not subsidized on any portion of their milk, this cannot be called a holdback but a straight, downright fine. Is it any wonder, then, that as a farmer for over 30 years I am suspicious of the absolute power that is granted by Bill C-197?

The provincial governments are going to be asked to collect this fine for the federal government. It is to be hoped that they will have enough guts to stand up to the federal government on this matter and protect the rights of their fluid milk shippers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!