very active politician. As he is ill, I hope that he will soon recover, in order to contribute with his customary enthusiasm to the proceedings of this House.

I continue to speak on the motion, because I wonder where medicine, whether it is dentistry or other branches, would stand if we had been unable to carry on our medical research on animals.

I wonder what stage medical science, and particularly surgical science, would have reached without the availability of research animals.

Finally I wonder what Best and Banting would have done, those great research scientists who discovered insulin, who succeeded in extracting from the pancreas of animals a fluid called insulin which has enabled the great number of diabetics—and God knows that among the Canadian people as among the population of the world the proportion of diabetics is great—to lead a normal life, that is to live like first class citizens.

In the treatment of shock as well as in the treatment by antitoxins, I wonder where we would be if animals had not been available.

Furthermore, I would like to say that the Food and Drug Directorate uses several species of animals in its laboratories in order to test new products which arrive on the market every day—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair to resume same at eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## PRAIRIE GRAIN STABILIZATION ACT

### PROVISION FOR PAYMENTS TO WESTERN CANADA PRODUCERS IN YEARS WHEN RECEIPTS BELOW FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lang that Bill C-244, respecting the stabilization of prairie grain proceeds and to repeal or amend certain related statutes, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned this debate at five o'clock I had been asking what stabilization is really all about. I am bothered because many members of the press and many people on the government side of the House keep speaking about the $100 million payment. Many politicians across the country have been talking about this $100



million. The Premier of Saskatchewan has talked about the $100 million which is to be paid out to the agricultural producers in that province. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang) also has talked about this $100 million. If we break this figure down we find that the average payment to the individual producer will be only $560. We also find that the largest amount any producer could receive under any circumstances would be $960.

• (8:10 p.m.)

If members opposite suggest that the votes of these people can be bought for $560, or if we the Premier of Saskatchewan believes that $560 will make the difference between success and failure in that province, they should be corrected. The average producer in this country knows what $560 will buy. I am positive that every member of this House knows what it will buy for him. It can be used very easily for contributions and other things without any problem at all. When talking about this mythical $100 million, the producers in western Canada realize that $560 will be the average payment. They will not be able to build even one grain bin to store their grain when the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act is done away with.

It is important that we realize that the stabilization program is not related to the cost of production or inflation. Both the gross and net farm income become less and less. Every year the average payment will be lower and the law of diminishing returns will step in. The minister is aware that in the present situation the law of diminishing returns will step in.

When we look at the bill before us we are actually looking at economic stagnation. We are talking about stabilization. Hon. members know what that is all about. It is stabilization of those least able to obtain a fair return on their investment. That type of stabilization is not in the interest of the agricultural producer or our economy generally. The stabilization which the government is talking about really means elimination. That is the name of the game that the federal and some provincial governments which support the stabilization plan are talking about. This whole nation will suffer from the consequences of any legislation brought in under this stabilization program.

The second problem, of which the minister is well aware, concerns competition against the treasuries of other nations. The government talks about stabilizing the income of our agricultural producers. Other nations subsidize agricultural producers through their treasuries. These nations have a fair and equitable standard of living. They take into consideration the cost of production and the inflationary spiral about which we hear so much. This country has always been one of the world's main producers of grain. We must realize that we are not being fair to those who produce the basic commodities of life. It is strange that the minister has introduced a bill such as this when we are not prepared to give favourable consideration to the backbone of our nation, the agricultural economy.