

I see a couple of members of the medical profession in the House. I suppose they know that some doctors have had to turn to agriculture because the medical profession's governing body would not let them practice. Those people, even though qualified, could not get a licence. Even though doctors are badly needed in certain areas of Canada, these people were not allowed to practice.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Whelan: If I have time at the end of my speech I will be glad to answer questions.

Mr. Alexander: What about lawyers?

Mr. Whelan: I could name other segments of our society. If real estate brokers are afraid that too many people will enter the real estate field and interfere with their earning \$50,000 a year, they withhold licences from new applicants. They are allowed to set the number that will enter the profession. Or let us talk about plumbers and electricians. How many young people have been refused membership as apprentices in the Electrical Workers' Union? I am using these examples merely to show that agriculture is the only part of our society without any controls. Nothing is done to provide for stability in that segment of our society.

I have always argued that our agricultural products know no provincial boundaries. I have said that in many speeches, and I said it even before becoming a Member of Parliament. We know this to be a proven fact, according to a recent Supreme Court ruling. We have seen in the past smart operators moving from province to province to escape producer marketing boards; sometimes they have done that with governmental help. The help came either from the province they were moving to or from the federal government. I do not approve of that. I know, as I am sure every member of this House knows, that such people have only one thing in mind, namely, making more money. They wanted to do that by taking advantage generally of all concerned. First, they wanted to take advantage of the producer; second, they wanted the advantage of cheap labour and, third, they wanted to take advantage of the consumer.

One may ask, how could they take advantage of the consumer? They do so by charging the consumer the price he would be charged if they were paying the regular price for produce and labour in other parts of Canada. I do not think very much of this practice. Although some of these operators have been successful, that is an unscrupulous type of operation and one that this bill can bring to a halt if producers generally want to take advantage of it.

These unscrupulous operators completely destroy any stability in price that a commodity might enjoy. They can do this because they are not strictly regulated. Anyone who knows anything about marketing boards will know that such boards bring about a high quality of product. Strict regulations encompass almost everything that the producer produces, the result being a product of high quality. Producers produce a high quality product under national marketing boards or provincial marketing boards. In the processing business in our area, which encompasses practically the whole area, the produce is

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

second to none and the consuming public receives the benefit of it. In other parts of the world it is not of such high quality.

• (4:20 p.m.)

We must also think of some of the things that have been done because of marketing boards across our country. I think particularly of the east coast and what has been done in respect of fish production there. Indeed, I also think of freshwater fish production. These marketing agencies are not without fault, but they are of great benefit to production and producers are in a much better position than ever before. The boards have not cost very much, either.

Some of the comparisons made with fascist and communist countries would be laughable if they were not so wrong. I have visited some of these countries and I have in-laws who come from them. My wife comes from a country with a socialist doctrine. When I visit large farms I like to compare them with the inefficient state farms. I know that in Yugoslavia the independent farmer produces the bulk of the food. We also know that western European countries receive a high price for their products. Hon. members mentioned this fact and suggested that we look at what these countries are doing for their farmers. They did not go further and say that these farmers have had strict marketing boards and that they have had them for a much longer period than Canada. Two examples are Great Britain and New Zealand. Both are democratic countries. They have had marketing boards for years and I understand they were established by other than socialist governments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I do so to advise him that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the wish of the House that the hon. member be allowed to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Whelan: I shall not be very much longer, Mr. Speaker. I know many Canadian farmers. I have received many letters from all across Canada. The farmers of this country are in favour of this bill in the ratio of 90 to 1. Some of those who are against it do not know why, but generally speaking have taken this position because someone has told them to do so. After studying the volumes of evidence and the thousands of words, some of which in farm language could be described only as hogwash, of the committee proceedings, I think there should be a time limit on committee proceedings and on every piece of legislation which appears before this House. If legislation is to be dealt with in a democratic fashion, there should be a time limit on it.

This bill should pass without further delay so that the farmers of Canada can take advantage of it if they want to do so. It is not being stuffed down their throats. It is being offered to them if they want to use it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe).