

*Supply—Agriculture*

naturally speaking for farmers generally throughout Canada. However, that does not appear to be the case.

During the past few days we have heard a great deal about assistance to farmers; P.F.A.A., feed grain freight subsidies, grain marketing assistance, livestock marketing assistance and various others types of assistance. Our ideas have been ably put forward on many of these matters by the hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Acadia. The hon. member for Acadia also gave a detailed outline of a crop insurance plan.

These policies that have been enunciated will, I believe, meet with the approval of farmers generally throughout Canada, including the farmers of Ontario and the farmers of British Columbia, not just the wheat farmers of the prairie provinces. I should like everyone in this committee to realize that I am deeply sympathetic toward the problems faced by the prairie farmers and the wheat growers. At the same time, however, I believe that in presenting solutions we must consider agriculture as a whole.

To come back to the affairs of other agricultural areas in Canada, may I say that I was glad to hear the hon. member for Kootenay West, when he was speaking the other night about agriculture in his part of the country, refer to certain marketing boards that had been set up to handle the problems there. I could not help comparing this arrangement with some of the ideas that have been launched by many people as solutions to the problems of agriculture.

I was particularly glad to hear mentioned by an hon. member the other night—I believe it was the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort—that he was not sure that subsidies were the answer to the farmers' economic problems. I agree with the sentiments he expressed. After listening to all these pleas for boards, financial assistance, government control and government regulation, I am beginning to wonder whether the farmers of the prairies have lost confidence in their own ability and initiative.

While making pleas for assistance of this nature we have heard hon. members in this chamber recently offer strong criticism of the Gardiner machine. It is a rather strange anomaly. I believe that in setting up all these rigid controls, financial assistance and subsidies we are building up a machine. I do not think there can be any argument about that, because it is common knowledge that the machine that is continuously paying out money gradually assumes domination over those to whom this money is being paid. In

fact there is truth in the old saying that the man who pays the piper calls the tune.

I believe this is something to which some serious thought could be directed. I am not going into it at length today; in fact I intend to make my remarks quite brief. But I think it will be recognized that in advocating a machine that, financially and politically, will lead to complete domination, we will get a machine that will put the so-called Gardiner machine to shame. I do not believe the farmers in the prairie provinces really wish that their affairs should be dominated to that extent.

I was glad to hear the hon. member for Kootenay West, in his speech the other evening, refer to Charlie Hayden, that grand farm leader, worker and publisher, who has done so much not only for farmers in the province of British Columbia where he lived but for farmers throughout Canada. He was one of the men whom it is a pleasure to have known and whose philosophy of living left a mark on all with whom he associated.

I am not going to argue with the hon. member for Kootenay West as to the qualities of the cherries in the Kootenays and in the Okanagan valley. I know good cherries are produced in the Kootenays. I have picked plenty of them from the trees there and have eaten them to excess, I am afraid, on more than one occasion.

I am also going to agree with the hon. member in what he says about the marketing system the British Columbia farmers have set up without government assistance, and I am going to enlarge upon his remarks. I want to emphasize strongly the fact that these organizations have developed to their present effective stage entirely by the personal, individual efforts of the growers themselves. There is no government paternalism, and there is no cost to the taxpayers of Canada. There is no government control, except provincial legislation which the farmers considered would be in their best interests, and which they drafted and asked the government to pass. There are no big financial handouts, and there is no government control that goes with such handouts. These agencies remain free. They are under the direct control of the growers themselves, and there is no intention of making any change.

It is true that differences arise as to policy and marketing problems, but these differences are threshed out at their board meetings, whether they are held quarterly, annually or for the special discussion of problems as they arise. I should like again to stress the fact that the individual growers