

achieve their aspirations for the good life, the just society or, more important than that, security.

I remember a number of years ago being at a meeting here in eastern Canada. We had invited an economist from the University of Saskatchewan—an economist for whom I had the highest regard and who is no longer with us—to come to that meeting and discuss the role of agriculture in an industrial society. He agreed to come. In his reply to me he said, “If you had written me a letter before the second world war, or even six or seven years ago, asking me to talk about the role of agriculture in the industrial society of Canada, I would probably have refused the invitation because at that time, in my opinion, we did not have an industrial society; but now we do have an industrial society.” Therefore, the role of agriculture has to be defined, considered and dealt with in light of the fact that agriculture is operating within an industrial society.

An industrial society as I see it, or as I observe it, Mr. Speaker, is a society in which monopoly operates, in which price maintenance is a daily fact of life and in which the government of the day—and in my province it brags that it is a free enterprise government—busily sets up a Prices and Incomes Commission to prevent those who are practising price maintenance from gouging the consumers of Canada. Admittedly, this commission is almost totally ineffective, but none the less this is its purpose. So, this is how the government of the day regards Canadian society.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, this bill is designed to operate in that kind of society. If this is so, it seems to me that the first question is, how effectively will it operate in that kind of society? The other question is, how much of a role will the actual producer play under the provisions of this bill? To what extent will the producer play a part in those decisions that will have to be made? To what extent will he continue to be the master of his own fate; to what extent will he become the servant of the state and, even worse, a pawn of the state in its manipulations of the economy and in the pursuit of its objectives in the world in which we live?

The previous speaker mentioned the Canadian Dairy Commission. I agree with him. The operations of the dairy commission give me cause for concern.

Mr. Dinsdale: Hear, hear.

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

Mr. Gleave: I have received letters from people who are desperate. Because their right, and indeed their ability, to earn a living on their farms has become seriously jeopardized, because in some instances they have been partially denied the opportunity to follow the vocation they had been following, and because they have been unable to put their case before the commission, these dairy farmers have, in desperation, written to their Member of Parliament asking, “What can you do for me?”

It may be, as individual marketing boards operate, that some instances of this sort of thing are unavoidable. But such things under the aegis of such boards, in my opinion, have been only too common. Under operation LIFT, we have a situation in which the government has taken powers wholesale unto itself. The Government advised this House that it was doing this with the support of the farm organizations and the provinces concerned. Yet within a few weeks of that announcement, we heard one of the major farm organizations saying, “No, this is not our baby.” It seems to me, therefore that there ought to be a provision in this bill, a provision I have not been able to find, that the farmers who are going to be affected by this legislation shall have the right to elect either the majority or possibly all the people responsible for directing any marketing board or agency which is set up.

• (3:50 p.m.)

It seems that this is an essential requirement if the individual farmer is going to be able to say when the operations of an agency are not serving his purposes or if an agency is operating very well. An individual farmer or a group of farmers who do not consider they are being fairly treated as a result of the operations of the agency should be able to come before a forum of their own people and say that this or that is happening to them or, in their opinion, the agency is not working well. This is the protection the farmer should have. According to this bill, the appointment of those people who are going to operate such an agency, will be at the pleasure of the government. The people who dreamed up operation LIFT in western Canada were selected at the pleasure of the government. Some individual farmers will suffer severely under that program because of the limited alternatives open to them. The unfortunate thing is there will be many such instances. I