

Employment Support Bill

This raises a great many problems. If this is really the feeling of Canada then I believe the Canadian government is bound to make it clear. It would be unfair to our colleagues in the International Monetary Fund or in the Group of Ten if they were allowed to believe by our silence that Canada has no policy of its own, that Canada would accept some new arrangement devised by bureaucrats in the I.M.F. I tell you they will have no support in this House from the hon. member for Duvernay if they ever come before this House with a proposal for parity at whatever level that might be assigned to us by others in Washington or in the I.M.F. no matter how many guns are held to our heads. We shall not accept any arrangements which are being set up on the lines "We shall not take your manufactured goods in the United States but we shall take all the raw resources which are given to us." We shall not accept such a role, the role which is assigned to us of being hewers of wood and drawers of water. We shall tell them that though we want freer trade as much as any other nation in the world, though we want a free flow of capital and people across the world, we want no new order imposed upon us under threats of protectionism or quotas or surtaxes.

We have our own national objectives. They amount almost to a single one, the resolution of the problem of unemployment in Canada. That is our objective and while we recognize and respect the right of other nations to have their objectives we demand only that they recognize ours.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to place before the House a picture of what we face in the farming and agriculture industry. Before doing so, I should like to remind hon. members of the situation which existed in agriculture before the United States took the action it did on August 15. As part of this exercise, I wish to quote from a publication issued by the Alberta Wheat Pool, the *Wheat Pool Budget* which recently contained an article setting out the situation facing farmers in western Canada.

Alberta Wheat Pool President G. L. Harrold said last week that not only Saskatchewan, but western Canadian agriculture as a whole has not been enjoying good years and that its relative position had depreciated during the past five years.

He went on to say that in 1970 the realized net income of western farm operators from farming operations was 44 per cent less than in 1967. The actual figures for the four western provinces as reported by D.B.S. were \$572,610,000 in 1970 compared with \$1,030,780,000 in 1967. Saskatchewan figures for the years under consideration were \$193,041,000 in 1970 and \$167,813,000 in 1969.

● (4:50 p.m.)

In 1968, the figure was \$365,588,000, and \$479,549,000 in 1967. He states that a similar trend exists in Alberta, though it is not as extreme.

There are other ways of measuring the agricultural economy, but I think the figures I have set out reveal what is happening to western agriculture. To put it another way, he states that Canada No. 2 northern wheat in Pacific ports export positions has declined 5½ cents

[Mr. Kierans.]

since January 1971 and 7½ cents at Thunder Bay. The price of hogs at Calgary was unchanged for the same period, and unchanged from January 1970. Prices of few, if any, farm products have advanced in the past five years, this despite the fact that weekly wages and salaries in the city of Calgary over the same period increased 30 per cent and the DBS index moved from 100.41 in 1967 to 130.43 in January, 1971.

The Alberta Wheat Pool president goes on to say:

Thus we see a reduction of 44 per cent in farm income, coinciding with an increase in average Canadian wages and salaries of 30 per cent.

I think this gives a picture of the position of the western agricultural economy before the recent action taken by the United States. It is in this context that we face a situation where additional impediments are going to be put in the way of Canadian agricultural exports to the United States. Perhaps no other country has been so generous in its acceptance of United States agricultural products as Canada. We have continually allowed U.S. imports to flow into this country while other areas—for example, the European Economic Community—have raised barriers when they found their farmers threatened.

By and large, we have considered our farming population and farming economy expendable. We have considered that agriculture could survive and live on its own resources; that it could continue to generate an increase in efficiency that would enable it to survive in spite of the situation so well described by the president of the Alberta Wheat Pool. For example, we have lived during the last year with hog prices that I am sure the Minister of Agriculture knows are not remunerative and will not return capital cost to the farmers. Now, at a time when the United States takes action that is going adversely to affect our farmers, what is the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture? A headline in the *Star-Phoenix* for August 18 reads "Olson plays down effects on farmers". The article reads, in part:

Federal minister of agriculture Bud Olson said Tuesday that the United States' decision to place a 10 per cent surtax on imports will not affect Canadian agricultural products as seriously "as rumors have led us to believe."

I do not know what are the rumours referred to there. Again, this is a *Star-Phoenix* headline in the September 2, 1971 edition: "Price freeze not so damaging to agriculture—Olson". I hope the minister is right; it would be nice to think that he is. However, a look at the facts does not bear this out. According to the government's own publication live cattle duties have increased from 1.5 cents a pound to 2.5 cents a pound for cattle under 200 pounds. The duty on cattle over 700 pounds within the specified quota has increased from 1.5 cents a pound to 3 cents a pound. Potatoes, which were at 37.5 cents per hundredweight, are still at 37.5 cents a hundredweight plus the 10 per cent surtax.

Let us go on to see what is the position of other products we sell to the United States. The surtax applies to some exports that go to the United States in quantity. For example, the duty on barley is 7.5 cents a bushel plus