

Employment Support Bill

then that is their privilege. I was saying that the Canadian government has made a proposal to the House that is supposed to keep the Canadian economy healthy. But I maintain that the proposition advanced by the government is unsound, and for the reasons I have advanced. Even at that, the government's proposal is effective only for certain industries; others will be left outside the scope of the bill.

One question that has been asked before is: What about those industries that do not qualify for assistance under this measure for one reason or another? I know of at least one industry in my own constituency that has informed me it will simply have to close its United States agency and cut its exports to nil. I am sure that this industry will be beyond the scope of the government's bill. If the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney), who is grinning at me from across the way and has been needling me, wants to be honest I am sure he could cite cases in Calgary of industries that are in the same position.

Mr. Mahoney: We all recognize the problem, but what is your solution?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Yes, tell us.

Mr. Gleave: If I proposed a solution to the members on the other side of this House, they would not accept it.

Mr. Mahoney: Try us.

Mr. Gleave: I have been arguing against a nonsensical grains bill for the last several months, but not one member on that side of the House has taken any notice of what I have said. So if they will not listen to me on a matter of which I have some knowledge, how can I expect them to listen to me on a matter on which I would not be considered an expert? In any case, it is the responsibility of members on the other side of the House to bring forward a measure that will meet the situation.

Mr. Cafik: We have.

Mr. Gleave: But it will not meet the situation. I have talked until now about the general application of this measure. When you get down to its particular application to primary producers, it is a failure. Its provisions do not apply to them. We have had presented to the House a measure to deal with a surcharge that the United States has placed on Canadian products, but it is a measure that deals with only part of the picture.

One company in my constituency exports 20 per cent of its products to the United States. If this company is affected by the U.S. surcharge it can probably make an application under this measure for assistance. But the primary producer who is affected by the U.S. surcharge can make no such application; he is left out in the cold.

It has been said that a processing company must maintain its price to the consumer. But at what level, Mr. Speaker? Hogs fluctuate up and down in price every day. Prices have been down to rock bottom at \$19 a hundred in Saskatoon for months, yet the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) has not lifted a finger to remedy the situation. The minister has been asked in this House what he is going to do about a whole range of agricultural products and he has stated that he will look at these products

[Mr. Gleave.]

commodity by commodity. Today he finally announced that he had taken a look at the situation regarding potatoes. But when is the minister going to get around to taking a look at the rest of the products?

• (9:00 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Rye, barley and tobacco.

Mr. Gleave: Yes, when will the minister get around to including tobacco? We have not been told in this House when he will get around to including assistance to the producers of these products. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) said today that 85 per cent of processed agricultural products will be included. I do not know how he arrived at that figure, but the figures we have indicate that 65 per cent of our agricultural products will be affected by the U.S. surcharge. We do not have any exact figures, but even on the government's figures what guarantee do we have that this protection will be of assistance to the producer?

The minister also referred to whisky as one of the main products. I suppose rye whisky is made from rye.

Mr. Mahoney: Guess again.

Mr. Gleave: If I guessed again I might suggest that some corn is also used, keeping in mind the usual remarks of that hon. member.

An hon. Member: Just like the speeches of the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney).

Mr. Gleave: In any event, rye and barley are two grains seriously affected by the surcharge, and those grains are sold at below the average price of a year ago.

Mr. Mahoney: I can't hear you.

Mr. Gleave: Then you should stick your thumbs in your ears.

Mr. Mahoney: It is your colleague from Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) who is bothering me.

Mr. Gleave: We should have had a clear statement from the Minister of Agriculture as to the policy in respect of farm products and how we are to meet this problem. Subsidies on farm products are being discontinued at the time this policy is proposed to assist manufacturing industries. We had in the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act a measure of assistance to the wheat farmer. This legislation could have been extended to take care of barley and rapeseed growers. This program was accepted without question by the United States, other competitors and importers. The logical thing to do at this time of extreme pressure from the U.S. and export markets is to continue that program and devise a companion program to assist our primary producers. In that way they might have something in the way of insurance for the years ahead when they may expect extreme export pressures. Instead of that, we are asked to adopt a stabilization program set up on percentages. This is a sort of never-never program. There is no way I can sell this government's proposal to the farm people in the communities of western Canada. As far as they are concerned, this is a non-program.