

Given the present economic situation and the restraints upon additional government spending, this allocation of funds is an indication of the importance we attach to the activities we have planned for International Women's Year. We have also established a special secretariat in the Privy Council Office to administer some of the special activities. These activities are being planned and implemented in co-operation with the provinces and with members of non-government organizations to ensure that we reach everyone across the country.

Last spring, the Prime Minister wrote to his provincial colleagues asking them to designate someone in their governments as a point of contact. Already two federal-provincial meetings of officials have been held to discuss plans as well as bilateral meetings with a number of the provinces. In addition to taking part in some of our programs, it is my hope that the provincial and municipal authorities will do their share in reviewing legislation and rethinking attitudes in their respective areas of jurisdiction so that discrimination will be attacked at all levels and in all fields. As Minister Responsible for the Status of Women, I will endeavor to convince my provincial colleagues to encourage their respective provinces to participate most energetically in International Women's Year.

However, to make this year a true success, we need the participation of all Canadians. I hope that, as in Canada's Centennial Year, everyone will undertake a project of their own to promote the integration of women in the life of the country. I see the year as a time for all of us, men and women, to assess our attitudes and, where necessary, change them so that in fact, and not in principle, Canada is indeed a country of equal opportunity for all.

[English]

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Madam Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I should first like to congratulate you upon appointment to your high office. I know that your respect for debate and your sense of fair play will stand you in good stead as you preside over this House. I might say that I believe the same is true of the Speaker himself; his respect for parliament and for fair play will stand him in good stead in the years ahead.

One can read the Speech from the Throne very closely but will see very little to solve the problems that Canada will face in the remaining years of the seventies, or even in the remaining years of this parliament. There is nothing in it to deal with inflation; there is no real indication of any concern for the difficulties faced by the various regions of Canada. It is suggested that by increasing the food supply we can somehow lower food prices, and I shall be dealing with that in a moment.

There is one sure way to cure inflation, and that is to work a little harder, be a little more productive, save a little more, and for all governments to spend a little less. There is no suggestion in the Speech from the Throne that the government is going to encourage Canadians to work a little harder, allow Canadians to be a little more productive, or that the government is going to curtail its spending one bit. The government says it is going to encourage greater food production and thereby lower food prices. An industry very close to my heart has a surplus of beef today, yet the farmer received approximately \$120 a head less for a butchered steer than he received a year ago. The

*The Address—Mr. Horner*

cost of meat on the counter is about the same. Where did this \$120 go, Madam Speaker? Inflation gobbled it up. The packer took \$30 and retailing and distribution costs accounted for \$80 or \$90. Yet although there is a surplus of meat, the price remains the same for the consumer because the government has allowed inflation to run wild.

There has been a great deal of talk in the recent past about eggs. Some people say their price is high, others say it is low. A couple of years ago we had a bill in the House known as the farm marketing bill, which set up CEMA. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) went on the radio in Ottawa and said that one man held up that bill for two years. Some consumers might be pretty annoyed that that man did not hold it up forever. I said that it would not work then, and I say it will not work now.

Why do I say that? I am not against marketing boards, but I do not believe that supply management will work in Canada. I said at the time that it might work in a small country such as Switzerland or Denmark; but who is so all-seeing and all-powerful on earth as to determine what should be produced where, and where the product should be marketed? I am not surprised that man should decide he has the wisdom to ship eggs from Newfoundland to British Columbia and somehow or other satisfy the customer. I am sure that if the matter had been left in the hands of the Lord, there would have been fresh eggs in B.C. at a cheaper price than letting man tinker with them. Why did it take the government two years to come to its senses and to realize this? I think the beef and hog producers are thankful that the bill does not apply to them, because man could have tinkered in their markets and made those markets even worse than they are today.

So far as government spending and a hard line on finance are concerned, the money supply has not been increasing in Canada during the last three months. But this, coupled with a wild extravaganza of spending, only creates greater hardship on the individual and the country—and it does not really matter which country it is. The individual has to pay higher interest rates because there is less money available, and the government is grabbing a great percentage of the amount that is available. That is what the government has been doing in the last three months—curtailing the money supply but not curtailing spending.

● (1510)

If the government did take a hard financial line it would improve the bond market, and anybody who has any knowledge of that market knows how bad it is. Perhaps such an attitude would improve the stock market, and anybody with stock other than the four-legged kind knows how bad it is. Perhaps this would improve the short-term interest investment field, allowing millions of Canadians to retain a little more money and thereby increasing the productivity of this nation. This is the only real long-run cure we have for inflation.

There was also mention of a transportation policy in the Speech from the Throne. Apparently the government has come around to thinking there should be greater competition between various modes of transportation. It is nice that it has come to its senses in this regard, but let us remember what happened in January of 1967. From Janu-