

government suggests they are for the problems facing agriculture at the present time? My first answer is, I think not.

I have noticed a thread running through all the speeches made in this chamber during the last couple of days, with virtually everyone accepting the principle that marketing boards are the answer. No one, so far as I have heard, has taken exception to the activities of marketing boards. No one has stood in his place in this chamber and offered anything in the way of criticism of marketing boards. Apparently we have naïvely accepted the premise that marketing boards are a way of life, and the government has assumed that marketing boards are the cure-all for the ills of agriculture.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that so far no concrete evidence has been put forward to show that marketing boards have in fact improved the situation for the farmer. I am distressed that some members blithely talk in support of this legislation, all-inclusive as it is, and give the impression that they believe all we have to do is pass this bill and farm problems will disappear as if by magic. I suggest that the problem goes much deeper than that. I ask, what do marketing boards do? What are they supposed to do? Have they done what was expected of them? Who has been the recipient of the greatest benefit, the producer or the consumer? I suggest it is the hired help, the bureaucracy that has attached itself to the marketing boards.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCutcheon: I am not about to try to discredit marketing boards but I hope to differentiate between efficient market sales agencies and what is involved in this bill, compulsory supply management types of agencies. I suggest that the duties of marketing boards are threefold. First, to sell the farmer's product to the best advantage. I think we are all agreed on that. Second, they should standardize quality to give a better balance of supply. Third, they should establish collective marketing where there are many sellers and few buyers. But how have they done? I can speak only of the province of Ontario, but I submit they have not done as well as they might in the selling field because they have not had active governmental support.

In Ontario we have a couple of classic examples of marketing boards and I should like to discuss one which falls in the category of supply management. I am referring to the Flue-cured Tobacco Board. This has the reputation of being a very successful organization, and single-handedly has been able to cut back the acreage each year for the last three years by about 50 per cent. I am not critical of the board in this respect because they have kept supply and demand in pretty good balance, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that their problem has been compounded by those confounded plant breeders. These individuals have consistently brought in new, high-yielding varieties of plants which double production. You need only half as many acres to grow tobacco if you are getting twice as much growth per acre. This board has also established an elite, highly capitalized group of tobacco grow-

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

ers with a closed shop in which no young Canadian can aspire to membership unless born into it.

We have heard a lot about opportunities for youth, but how hollow that sounds. If youth wanted to start in agriculture, particularly in the tobacco growing areas, I question very much whether it could be done. A young man could have the best training and expertise in the world but could only get into the tobacco industry if he were born into it. Another thing that is missing in this bill and which has contributed to the success of the Flue-cured Tobacco Board is strict import controls. There is nothing about that in this bill. But on April 14, 1970, when the minister introduced Bill C-197 he made a platitudinous statement to which I shall refer a little later.

Mr. Paproski: Promises, promises.

Mr. Olson: A good thing we keep them, isn't it?

Mr. Bigg: What about \$2 wheat, Mr. Richardson?

Mr. McCutcheon: We have examined a supply management type of marketing board, Mr. Speaker. Now let us look at the Hog Marketing Board. Some of these boards have been pretty successful, by which I mean that they have closely followed the prices established by the United States market. If the province of Ontario or the federal government have the temerity to question the actions of a marketing board, there is the stock answer, "Where would we have been without the board?" I should like to put on record a few facts relative to the Hog Marketing Board and other livestock boards in the province of Ontario. Some of the proponents of marketing boards should study their performance.

Ten years ago in the province of Ontario hogs sold at \$27.58 on a dressed weight basis. Today they sell at almost \$28. In 1961, cattle, which do not come under a marketing board, sold at \$21.12 live weight, and today they sell at \$34. It is interesting to note that since 1961 the Ontario Hog Marketing Board has collected a few for each hog marketed. Until 1965 or 1966 this was 42 cents, then it went up to 45 cents and to 60 cents, so it has averaged 45 cents per hog marketed in a ten-year period during which time 25,700,000 hogs were marketed. At 45 cents each, this brought the Hog Marketing Board between \$11 million and \$11½ million of the farmers' money. For this, all the farmers got was a big staff in Toronto. The packers used to send out the cheques, but now that is done by the board.

Mr. Paproski: Shame! How do you like that, McBride?

Mr. McBride: Why don't you say something relevant?

Mr. Paproski: You tell that to your people in Lanark county.

Mr. Bigg: Back in your pulpit!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. McBride: Mr. Speaker, since other members keep referring to me, I wonder if they would permit me to ask whether they would refer to the bill rather than condemn marketing boards. No one is arguing for or against them.