

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

would rest with the federal government. This was not opposed in the case of the Canadian Wheat Board, nor the Canadian Dairy Commission though the first was introduced in times of emergency and the second to assist the dairy industry, and did not offer any threat to the continuation of existing provincial marketing boards.

...There are 120 provincial producer-controlled boards; vested interests have been created, both personal and organizational. Provincial departments of agriculture have a long involvement in marketing board legislation and operations, and they will be reluctant to jeopardize the work of the past and turn over much of their role to the senior level of government.

## The report continues:

To implement rational supply management, the whole structure of institutions and criteria would have to be radically changed. This is not a matter of the desirability or necessity of national marketing boards as opposed to provincial boards, but of a national supply management agency which would encompass practically all of agriculture. Commodity marketing boards, whether national or provincial might prove a political hindrance to rational supply management in the interest of all farmers and total farm income.

## And in conclusion, the task force stated:

Supply management of the all-pervasive type which would be in position to allocate resources rationally, would have to include most farm products, would involve inspection, research, administration and control far exceeding anything we have experienced in Canadian agriculture to date. Such an extreme should be avoided at all cost if reasonable satisfactory alternatives exist. Fortunately, there are alternatives, which though not fully satisfactory, should be given every opportunity before launching the "ultimate weapon" of supply management.

In total, this would seem to indicate to me that the task force did not advocate supply management and market management as the government has indicated in Bill C-197.

Again, Mr. Charles Munro accepted a kind of supply management entirely different from the structure available to the government in Bill C-197. He states:

On the subject of supply management and national marketing boards, it is clear, we think—and here we agree in general with the task force—that a high degree of market organization is necessary and inevitable. In continuing integration in some form of supply—production—processing—distribution is inevitable. But farmers want to keep their business in their hands as this process moves forward. They want to determine, for themselves, the choices that are made among the often hard alternatives that face them. They want to remain independent producers working with other farmers. Without comprehensive organization by producers, without intensive research as a priority need, without willing and forward looking co-operation from governments the job will not be done. This job urgently needs to be done, though the kind and degree of supply management and marketing methods required will vary from commodity to commodity.

[Mr. Ritchie.]

There are many other distasteful features of this bill. The bill proposes that Parliament grant the government a monopoly of the agricultural industry of Canada, except for interprovincial marketing of grain and dairy products.

Under clause 17, the cabinet will have power to delegate the complete control and regulation of any natural product of agriculture to a cabinet-controlled agency. This power extends to deciding who can grow it or produce it, who can sell it, buy it, price it, assemble it and any other act till it gets to the ultimate consumer. The cabinet will directly control this by means of the National Farm Products Marketing Council. All members of the council are to be appointed at the pleasure of the government. All the supporting staff will be civil servants, either by appointment or assignment. The council will be a completely dominated government agency and completely subject to cabinet administrative direction. Marketing agencies can be established without public hearings, although the government may direct the council to hold hearings. Agencies will be effectively removed from control of Parliament because they will be corporate bodies.

The agency, once established, will have complete control over its designated product and will be responsible for operating its own resources. This means that no matter how badly it operates, it will be able to charge up its losses to the growers and producers by imposing levies and fees. This amounts to delegation of taxing powers. The bill can control any agricultural produce grown anywhere. This was correctly interpreted by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) on April 14, as recorded at page 5871 of *Hansard*:

With respect to international ramifications, the bill does not provide the opportunity to give marketing agencies established under it direct or, indeed, automatic control over the importation of agricultural products. In certain circumstances authority could be delegated to these agencies.

In fact, the government could, without consulting the consumer, producer, Parliament or GATT agreement, regulate the supply and price of food products entering Canada.

Now, this bill is in line with the policies of the present government. The Wheat Board Act is being as a basis for the LIFT program, so that by means of the quota system production is to be stopped, but the quota system was originated to give fair market opportunities. Similarly, thousands of small dairy producers have been put out of business by