

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

posed act is a government take-over of all decision making in Canadian agriculture, including production—a fact he has denied. The bill asks Parliament to grant the government a monopoly in the agriculture industry in Canada.

Under clause 17 the government, without the necessity of consultation with anyone or with any farm organization, will have power to delegate the complete control and regulation of any product of agriculture to a cabinet controlled agency, and let us not forget that fact. This cabinet or ministerial power can range from deciding who can grow or produce any agricultural product, to who can sell it, who can buy it, who can price it, who can assemble it, who can transport it, who can process it, who can store it, and who can be engaged in the field of agriculture or any of its allied industries.

Is this what the farmers want? We do not think so. As I stated previously, this bill has a deceptive title. It conceals the intent or principle behind it, in our opinion. The wording of the bill, and the minister's attempts at an explanation, camouflage the government's power once the bill is passed.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The council will be a government agency and, therefore, completely and utterly subject to cabinet or ministerial direction. That is why we on this side of the House maintain that the principle of the bill is not what the minister implies, a producers' marketing bill, but rather a bill giving government control over the entire industry, even to the extent of determining which farmer will survive and which farmer will not. This is a principle we cannot support.

I am sure that the farm organizations will not support this type of principle. I am sure this is not what the farmers I represent want. This is not what the farmers and farm organizations have been requesting. This is not what the farmers believe the minister is endeavouring to establish by Bill C-197 at the present time. I am sure that once the farmers realize just what this bill contains they will be as alarmed, as my colleague from Frontenac-Lennox and Addington was when he said that his enthusiasm turned to alarm after he read the bill.

The minister has implied that we in the Conservative party are trying to create a fear about "state control," the reason for which does not exist in the bill. I would suggest to the minister that he has not been listening to

the spokesmen for the other opposition parties. I would like to put on record again some of the remarks made by some members of the other parties. I refer first to page 6995 of *Hansard* where the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) is reported as saying:

However, state control per se involves certain risks. There is every evidence that some clauses of the bill can do more harm than good to producers.

Again, on the same day, one of the NDP members, the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg), made these statements as recorded at page 6991 of *Hansard*:

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.

A little further on, he said:

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 every reason to be suspicious.

Further on, he said:

I am sure that many people across the country are beginning to wonder whether the wide marketing powers of the cabinet are in the best interests of those in the agricultural production business.

We are wondering that also. He went on to say:

We know what happened recently with the LIFT program. The government used the big club and told farmers not to plant, that if they did plant the club would come down and they would have no quota.

This is exactly what is happening to the small farmer today in western Canada.

Using that as an analogy, I am sure that this is why some people are concerned at the provisions of Bill C-197, now before the House. Equally, I am sure it is why most members of the House will support the amendment of the hon. member for Crowfoot. If the amendment were accepted, there would be broad representation provisions in a new bill. This is our concern at the present time and I am sure it is the concern of many people in this nation.

I also wish to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe) as recorded at page 6685 of *Hansard* for May 7:

I shall say right away that this legislation will exert an absolute control over the entire farm economy, and add that the Liberals have certainly not been elected to bring in a socialist system—

Then, he went on to say:

I do not know why the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson)—who studied the principles of free-