

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

can be controlled by another department. But if the ten provinces are not tied into a marketing scheme, imports into a province taking part in the scheme cannot legally be controlled. If imports are allowed into any region, this marketing act will not and cannot work. Members of the government would not listen to the opposition when we put this proposition to them. They preferred to rush into the formulation of legislation which will not work.

Right from the outset we suggested a certain course of action to the government. The poultry producers were actually the designers of this principle the government has adopted. If hon. gentlemen opposite had set a scheme up for the poultry industry there would have been no opposition from this side of the House. If the people who produce the commodity want this, they should have it. If this had been done, if our advice had been taken, the legislation would have been passed. It is the government which must take the blame for the delinquency of this legislation, not the opposition. If the government had taken our advice and provided for supply management in the poultry industry, and if it had worked, if it had solved the problem, the other commodity groups would be beating at the doors of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) asking them to bring in similar legislation. But they declined to do this. They wanted to bring in an all-encompassing bill. Mr. Speaker, there is no agronomist in this country who believes it is possible to make an all-encompassing bill work when there is such diversity in regions, jurisdictions and commodities as there is in Canada.

**An hon. Member:** You are being negative now. Try to be positive.

**Mr. Danforth:** You talk about my being negative. I am trying to suggest to hon. members opposite that this is not a red letter day for farmers: it is the beginning of the greatest disaster the farm economy of Canada has ever experienced. It is the beginning of the end for thousands and thousands of farmers. If this bill goes forward the small farmer, God help him, has not got a chance.

• (11:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Paproski:** That means you guys from Quebec. Remember that. You are going to get it in the ear.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. I invite hon. members to co-operate with the Chair and the House and let the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth) complete his remarks.

**Mr. Danforth:** There is one other point hon. gentlemen of the government have completely missed. It is this. Whenever quotas are established by regulation, they immediately obtain a capital value. When these quotas obtain a capital value, the cost of production of every unit increases to the extent of that capital value. There are only two places this increase can come from, the profit margin of the farmer whom the government is trying to help, or the consumer of whom the government is the champion. An added tax will be placed on every unit of either one or both of these segments of society.

The government is not going to help either the agriculturist or the consumer. We can foretell what is going to

happen. As soon as the government finds that the cost of an item of food is affecting the index, it will allow in imports to offset that increase. What will happen is the quota to the farmer will be reduced by the amount of the import. We will find that the agricultural economy in Canada will be travelling in an ever smaller and smaller circle until it is completely garrotted.

**Mr. Faulkner:** What about the industrial milk shippers?

**Mr. Danforth:** We know about them. The hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Faulkner) asked about industrial milk shippers. I will tell him. Under this government, the industrial milk shippers in our area have been reduced from 440 to 72. That is what happened.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Danforth:** The only ones left are those who had a nice comfortable quota to start with. This gave them the money to buy out the man who had a small quota, one who was trying to start. He just could not make it. That is what happened.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but according to the order accepted previously today his time has expired.

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Some hon. members suggest that the hon. member for Kent-Essex be allowed to complete his remarks. That can only be done with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member complete his remarks?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Danforth:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my thanks for the courtesy of all members of the House in allowing me to continue. I shall not transgress on Your Honour's patience. I conclude by saying that I do not impute motives to any member of this House. I am sure every member has tried to bring a bill out of this House which would help agriculture. This is a complicated measure and hon. members on the government side did not understand its implications. We in the opposition must show our displeasure, disfavour and feelings by voting against this bill which will spell doom to the agricultural industry.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. H. E. Stafford (Elgin):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth) started off by saying we have passed a bill which is of major importance to Canadian agriculture. Then he alleged provincial marketing boards were not the answer. We never said they were. He then contradicted himself by stating that the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan) is sitting pretty; all his crops are protected by provincial marketing boards. The hon. member for Kent-Essex could enjoy the same protection. He knows full well they are voluntary. Years ago, the opposition used the same argument in opposing the Canadian Wheat Board. The hon. member for Kent-Essex is running in the same circles tonight; he stated we had the Wheat Board.