

to be perpetrated upon us in the name of some kind of national economic policy? What kind of misguided direction are we going to receive? When, if the government finally tells us it has made up its mind, will we hear about the whole question of foreign ownership? I shudder to think about that. I can visualize ten provincial premiers, assorted business and labour leaders and many others shuddering in this same regard.

We know only too well that this country is just too complex and too varied in its needs and possibilities to believe that one or even a few people in their isolated place in the east block are capable of producing the sort of policies to give vital and viable direction to the economic life of this country. We just do not believe it is possible. In fact, we know that kind of leadership can do very grave damage to the delicate economic fabric of this country. We know how delicate the economic life of this country is because of very high unemployment at the present time and the recurrence of inflation.

It is our belief that important and basic economic policies of this kind require open and frank consultation in many areas. Obviously, there has to be consultation with the provinces. We have the almost ludicrous situation where the province of Ontario, the largest and the wealthiest of the provinces, published its own document with regard to its concern about the heavy inroads of foreign investment. When questions are raised in the House—and I raised such questions with the Prime Minister before Christmas—as to which way this material is to be utilized or whether there is any action being taken with those in the province of Ontario, there is really no response.

What about the provinces in western Canada which have a tremendous interest at stake in the development, in various aspects, of the basic resources of this country? It is important for them to participate directly in the elaboration of any policy. In my own area, the Atlantic provinces, which for almost three-quarters of a century have languished in a situation of chronic underutilization of the economy, it is important for them to believe that any national policy must be sufficiently varied and tailored so as to deal realistically with the problem of regional disparity in that area. However, there seems to be almost no awareness or concern about these kinds of basic questions.

Beyond the provinces, there are those who have responsibility in management, labour and major municipalities in respect of decisive action that could be taken which would very much prejudice their own health and viability. Again, there is no openness or consultation, only a process of confrontation leading finally to isolation. That kind of style or method of dealing with these basic problems can only lead this country into a deeper morass of economic and social difficulty. It will do little good for the government to tell us a year or six months from now that they have been able effectively to deal with the latest crisis that has in effect been directly manufactured by them.

The time has come for Canadians to say to this government that we must put an end to government that seeks to rule, not by participation as was so grandly talked about three or four years ago, but by the lights of its own desires and failure to recognize the importance that Canadians, those represented in other groups and at other political

levels, have a right to be represented in decision-making that makes all Canadians accountable and responsible or effective government in this country.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my colleagues in all parts of the House in congratulating the hon. members who proposed and seconded the motion for acceptance of the Speech from the Throne which is under debate at the present time. I realize that this debate gives us an opportunity to discuss some of our parochial problems as well as to make suggestions with regard to what some members of the House of Commons, especially those on the opposite side, have said and with which we do not entirely agree.

I was rather shocked this afternoon to hear the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) discuss the bills relating to agriculture. I have been associated with this industry for many years. I honestly feel we have made more headway in developing governmental legislative assistance to Canadian agriculture than any other Parliament. We have finally succeeded in passing one of the most essential bills to assist farmers, Bill C-176, the National Marketing Act.

Unquestionably, the farming community has developed a great deal of efficiency. Through technological advancement, hard work and training we have been able to take advantage of the well educated young people who have worked in the farming industry, both in production and in secondary industry. They have been able to produce in great volume—as a matter of fact, in excess volume—but the problem that has been hounding the agricultural industry for years, more so now than ever before, is that of marketing the product.

• (1750)

The marketing of food has been based on the quantity available, rather than on a reasonable price related to the cost of production. As a result of the passage of Bill C-176, enabling legislation is now available to the farming community. They can now establish marketing agencies to act in conjunction with advisory committees and with the co-operation of secondary industry, known as "the trade", consumer associations and distributors, they will be able to provide food for Canadians as cheaply as ever before, I am convinced—food at lower cost as a result of stability in the farming industry.

I was personally delighted to hear the announcement by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang) that there is to be a two-price system for wheat in Canada. This has been recommended from time to time; it has been discussed fully and I am convinced that when the program has been established and the regulations respecting the method of payment have been worked out, it will prove of great assistance to the prairie grain farmer. I might add that the Prairie grain farmer was fortunate enough to sell more grain last year than in any other year in our history.

Here, I should like to refer to the price, and to the criticism which is often directed to the level of the price received for Canadian grain. Canada exports 75 per cent of its grain and sells about 25 per cent domestically.