

*Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

saying now. With a finger pointing heavenwards, he stated that each Canadian citizen should receive a national dividend and thus get his share of the production. He added that consumption is the only purpose of production and that it is futile to produce for the sake of production if the product does not reach the consumer. Mr. Speaker, he said all this in the other official language, with much greater eloquence than I do, so I feel he is able to understand what I am saying.

I do not claim that Bill C-197 should be burned or tossed aside. I maintain it is false and dishonest to say in the House and to tell Canadians that the bill will solve the problem of over-production.

The problem of overproduction cannot be taken care of as long as the problem of underconsumption has not been settled, and as long as the products have not been made available to the consumers. I wish to refer to the United States which developed a \$2-billion program for distributing milk to school children. In Canada, they drink Cokes and Seven-Ups, for the farm organizations cannot afford to set up an advertising system that could compare with that of the Coca-Cola Company, for instance, which sells Cokes at \$30 per hundredweight. If we figure it out quickly, we see that producers work for nothing and, in addition, they are penalized.

Here again, there is a loophole in the legislation: there is no provision for the setting up of an intensive publicity campaign about farm products and by-products and their various uses. There is no provision connected with a research program to find other uses for dairy products.

We can give ourselves all the plans we want but if we do not make production available to the consumers we have solved absolutely nothing.

Before I resume my seat, it is my duty to set something straight. At the time of the demonstrations in Sherbrooke I was most distressed by the fact that not one government member from Quebec, and more than 50 of them want to impose on us the present dairy policy, was there to explain this policy. Once again, the Cr ditistes alone were there to speak for the milk producers. The federal Liberal members were not there. I still believe, in spite of the nonsense uttered by the member for Richelieu that their cowardness prevented them from going to Sherbrooke. Yet they had been duly invited.

Next Friday night will take place—

[Mr. Fortin.]

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I have cautioned before about proceeding on this line of argument. It seems to me it results only in a series of points of order which are quite irrelevant to the subject before the House. I suggest that the hon. member not pursue it. I take it the hon. member has concluded his remarks.

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, in discussing Bill C-197 which is before the House today, may I say the government has introduced a very severe form of farm marketing legislation the like of which was not, I am sure, contemplated even by the most enthusiastic farm products marketing board supporters in the past. This, in my opinion, is a thoroughly bad bill as presently constituted, and I shall endeavour to convince the government that the bill would be very detrimental if passed in its present form.

Marketing boards have had a fitful vogue for many years on the agricultural scene in Canada. For most farm commodities, they have been provincially controlled, and were always handled in a certain way. First of all, a significant number of producers of a particular commodity would petition the government to set up a marketing board. The provincial government then investigated the matter, and if it decided to proceed then all the producers were registered and a vote was taken. If a majority, say 66 per cent, were in favour, a board was set up with the producers in full control. They elected officials to carry out the policy of the board and every year at annual meetings these producer-elected officials had to give an accounting. Then, if a significant number of producers petitioned the government to have a referendum carried out, a referendum was held and the board disbanded if the majority of producers favoured this course.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), in his statement, suggested that farm organizations had been waiting a long time for this type of legislation. But in briefs and at the Canadian Agricultural Congress farm organizations have been asking for a kind of national marketing legislation which would establish agencies jointly initiated and administered by government and farmers.

What does this bill propose? It proposes to develop a structure which is exclusively governmental and which was not given support by either the government's task force or farm