

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

the machinery and once the machinery is set in place it will be up to the farmers themselves to determine whether they want to make use of the machinery provided by government policy and government planning.

As I read the bill—whether this is deliberate, I do not know—it seems to me it is certainly a misrepresentation of the powers that are set down in the bill to control rigidly and coercively the whole agricultural industry at the production level, because it seems to me that the cabinet has complete monopoly power. The minister and those who defend the bill talk about public hearings where the *vox populae* will be able to express itself. But this is optional, it is not mandatory; and judging from our experience in other areas of government action and policy it will be the exception rather than the rule for the government to consult, in the intimate terms that it professes in the statements of the minister, with the agricultural producers.

There is nothing in the legislation, as I see it, which indicates that after the consultations, the recommendations which will be forthcoming will be followed by the government. I know that the government's attitude has been to completely ignore public opinion because it follows the philosophy—this goes back to the pursuit of power that has been characteristic in most areas of government action under the Trudeau administration—of going completely against the wishes of the public with respect to public action and policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dinsdale: The minister also makes the point that in this legislation he is attempting to follow the precedent of provincial marketing boards that are already established. As I read some of the background papers that were presented to the Agricultural Congress, which will result in a task force report which has been pending for several years, the warnings with respect to marketing boards were diametrically opposed to the sort of solution proposed in this bill. For example, one of the papers said that to provide the marketing boards with powers on the scale proposed in the legislation would be to provide the "ultimate weapon" in supply management control.

This is not the positive program of agricultural adjustment to be implemented without authoritarian police and procedures such as was requested, for example, by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in its representa-

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

tions to the cabinet as recently as April 9. To compare it with the sort of producer-controlled marketing board at the provincial level is, of course, a deliberate misrepresentation of the situation. Rather than being patterned on that precedent, the federal plan erodes the constitutional rights of the province in agricultural marketing. For example, they will be able to levy special charges or make special levies, which is a sort of arbitrary, delegated, indirect system of taxation.

My time has almost expired. Rather than go into another aspect of my argument, may I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

TRADE—GRAIN—SUGGESTED PERMANENT FOREIGN SALES MISSIONS

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) has had enough punishment for today, but since he is in such a genial mood I hope he will take my comments into consideration.

On March 13 I asked the minister whether, in view of the statement of the secretary general of the Canada Grains Council, we should have permanent foreign marketing missions to promote grain sales, if Canada is to retain markets and gain new markets, and if the minister could tell the House whether the government was considering the establishment of such foreign marketing missions.

The minister suggested at that time that the Canada Grain Council was really set up to consider this type of selling mission. In a supplementary question I asked if the minister could indicate whether the government was considering setting up such missions throughout the world. Again he suggested that he had received no direct communication from the secretary general of the Grain Council and that all he knew was what he had read in the newspapers.

The reason I raised this question was that many people throughout this country are condemning the Canadian Wheat Board. They are suggesting there should be selling agencies other than the Canadian Wheat Board. I then placed on the Order Paper a question which related very clearly to the question I asked on Orders of the Day, asking how many brokerage firms are now handling Canadian grain sales.