

My friends to the left say that we need unions and that farmers should be unionized. My hon. friend from Fraser Valley West knows that this bill does not set out any provisions for collective bargaining. It will simply strangle the young man's opportunity to become engaged in the agricultural industry. Opportunity will no longer be based upon ability, knowledge, initiative or desire, but rather upon ability to garner the necessary funds to buy out someone who is well established or some corporation.

In other words, the vested interests will be protected and the young farmer will end up paying for his equipment, his facilities and probably a handsome sum for good will. This would seem to me to be a retrograde step in the land of opportunity which I believe Canada still is. I believe there is still opportunity in the agricultural industry, but this bill is a retrograde step.

Furthermore, this bill constitutes, I believe, an inward approach to solving the ills of agriculture by controlling production, creating provincial barriers, and closing out the prospect of deeper penetration of export markets. I believe we must be ever conscious of the very important part the export of our agricultural commodities plays in our world trade. I believe we must be expansionary in our approach.

I think this bill places a damper on the future growth of our export industry. I am not alone in this belief; an editorial in the *Country Guide* lays this out in very clear terms. In speaking about the effect of the deal which was consummated by the provinces in relation to solving the chicken and egg war, it states:

The agreement could bring them short-term relief for it may offer one way to bring egg prices back up to survival levels. But it may be little more than a short-term reprieve.

This bill is only ratifying the agreements that were basically reached by the provincial ministers of agriculture in respect of allocation of commodities and so on. The article states:

But the effects of the agreement extend far beyond the poultry industry.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The development places all farmers face-to-face with the most urgent issue facing them. Can their industry be one of growth? Dare Canada's farmers search for new and expanding markets in the U.S. and elsewhere in the face of Ottawa's apparent readiness to shut the border to U.S. food products and the likelihood of retaliation?

The implications for beef and hog producers and others, who might want to share in fast growing consumer markets in other countries, could be devastating.

It compels them to ask if they, too, must begin to cut back to Canada's domestic needs. Must they begin the retreat from export markets? Or must they commit their time and resources to a life-and-death struggle against politicians who would strangle them with restrictions and controls? The development forces each farmer to ask himself if government has abandoned its ancient role of being a servant of the farmer and set its sights on becoming his master?

The poultry agreement results from another failure by Ottawa, and by provincial governments as well, to recognize the importance of agriculture and to develop policies which could give farmers an important role in Canada's future.

In that context one might very well ask what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) meant in his speech to the thirty eighth meeting of the B.C. Federation of Agricul-

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

ture in New Westminster B.C. when, in outlining his agricultural program, he said:

This means a minimum of government intervention but a maximum of government help.

It would be rather interesting to hear the minister explain the context of this bill and its relation to a statement of that nature.

I and many other speakers who have participated in the long debate on this bill in committee and in the House believe that this measure is part of the over-all program of speeding up the rationalization process of the small farmers. There have been some changes, a new dressing on the cake, you might say. Some titles have been changed; for example a program has been renamed from an adjustment program to a small farm development program, but the content is the same.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I must do so to advise him that his time has expired.

Mr. Horner: I think the House is prepared to give the hon. member extra time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member may continue if there is unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mazankowski: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to thank hon. members for allowing me to speak for a few minutes more.

I would merely like to place on the record the statements of Mr. Runciman, who is a well known and highly regarded individual, particularly in Canadian farm circles. He speaks of the same fear that we have expressed on so many occasions, that policies have been introduced by this government which have been aimed at speeding up the rationalization process. He states:

The Canadian government's policies are designed to constantly cut back production and work toward a shortage situation and, if they force farmers out of business in the process, that's to their advantage.

"The NFU believes milk production in particular should be expanded, not curtailed, because it is a key food around the world."

Mr. Runciman is concerned with other farm spokesmen about the new federal development program which "regardless of the fine words ... aims to reduce the number of farmers in this country".

He goes on to say that there are programs which could be incorporated:

Farmers in the Common Market countries receive more than double what Canadian farmers get for their grain, prices which make "your mouth water" Mr. Runciman said.

"With prices like these stimulating production elsewhere in the world I think Canada would be ill advised if she went ahead and tried to solve world surplus problems with a unilateral program to reduce the number of farmers in this country".

This is the concern which we have continually expressed with regard to this bill. We feel that in the definition of a farm product all commodities should be excluded until such time as plebiscite is held or a significant number of producers of that commodity signify that they want to become party to the marketing plan. I do not believe that this is asking for too much. If this is indeed