

*Restraint of Government Expenditures*

● (2130)

The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) and the minister of agriculture of the Tory government in Edmonton agreed that we should have inland terminals. They not only agreed that we should have them, but also that they should receive incentives. So Tories agree with Liberals on inland terminals. In fact, they even want to help outfits like the Cargill Grain Company.

I do not know where the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre received that information, but I have a reasonably good idea. I know for a fact that he is not illiterate but I know from time to time he has some difficulty understanding what he reads. In particular, the statements he made concerning me are totally inaccurate.

I can only believe his information is as a result of a presentation I made to the Hall Commission on grain handling and grain transportation in Moose Jaw earlier this year. I should like to quote briefly from my presentation simply to get the matter on the record. In that presentation I said:

Efficiency of handling grain and at the least cost to the producer is very important if we are to maintain a viable grain and livestock industry in western Canada. I wonder at the efficiency of several companies operating elevators at one delivery point with a duplication of facilities. Would it not be more efficient to have one large house where the various companies share the capital cost and allow the producer to determine which company he would deal with?

A large house would provide facilities for drying, cleaning, protein grading and could prepare various grades for loading into unit trains for direct shipment to export position. The screenings would be available for feeding livestock in the immediate area. Protein grading would mean that the producer would be paid for the quality of the product he produces.

Such an arrangement would not mean a reduction in staff but rather would guarantee jobs for those who might find their employment in jeopardy because of the closing down of some of the smaller houses.

That was only the statement I made with regard to grain handling and transportation. Certainly it is not possible to read into that statement what the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre has attributed to me.

Coming to the specifics of this particular bill, I was pleased to see that it does away with the Company of Young Canadians. I think the majority of Canadians will agree it is time that organization came to an end. The Company of Young Canadians together with the OFY has been a drain on our economy. Perhaps it has given some young people the opportunity to travel, but it has not been a productive exercise.

I suggest the LIP program should go the same way.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Neil:** The LIP program is not productive so far as the people of Canada are concerned. It provides jobs on a temporary basis to people who are unemployed, but if you examine the majority of the LIP programs, Mr. Speaker, you will find that when the programs come to an end not one thing has been done to add to the community. This is the situation in the majority of cases.

**Mr. Goodale:** That is not true. There have been all sorts of capital projects for small towns in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Neil:** The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) talks about the small towns in Saskatchewan. I am concerned about the small towns throughout Saskatchewan.

[Mr. Neil.]

**Mr. Goodale:** LIP has done a lot for them.

**Mr. Neil:** Perhaps, but it has not done very much so far as I am concerned for the small towns. If the government wanted to do something for the small towns, not only in the province of Saskatchewan but throughout Canada, it would develop a program and utilize the money it has spent on LIP to develop facilities in those towns of a lasting nature whether they be curling rinks, senior citizens' homes, or what have you.

**Mr. Goodale:** They did that in Assiniboia.

**Mr. Neil:** I grant that it has been done in certain cases, but if one examines the LIP program generally one will find that it has not had a lasting effect so far as the communities are concerned. Basically if one talks to the people who are involved in the LIP program, and examines the applications, generally speaking one will find that these people are reluctant to fund a program which will give a facility to a small town. They are more concerned with programs which have no lasting effect but which simply provide employment. I am not saying that the money be not used but rather that the LIP program should be changed so that it will have a lasting effect in communities throughout Canada.

All of us were happy to see the end of Information Canada. When I first came here I received a letter from a constituent who wanted certain information. I assumed the place to go for the information would be Information Canada because the name seemed to indicate it was a department or a branch of government that would be able to supply one with information. I found that Information Canada was simply a glorified bookstore. If one wanted information one had to know what information was required and then dig it up oneself. I think most people in Canada are happy to see the end of Information Canada.

I noted with interest under clause 10 that the Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act grants will be cut off at the end of the calendar year and will not be renewed. Research and development are important so far as our country is concerned. Without research and development we would still be travelling with the horse and buggy and still be using iceboxes instead of refrigerators.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Instead of the Jetstar.

**Mr. Neil:** Instead of the Jetstar as the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville says. It is important that we not only continue grants for research and development but that we increase them. If one examines the area of agriculture and the estimates for the past number of years one will note that there has been no increase in these grants. With the rate of inflation we have seen in the last number of years the effect has been a cut-back in research and development.

Recently I received a letter from the Agricultural Institute of Canada. Attached to the letter is what is called "The AIC Position". I should like to quote from that in part:

One of the fundamental requirements of an efficient food production system is a sound, adequately financed and well co-ordinated research and development