

Mr. Allard: Mr. Speaker, I would like a chance to speak. I think that I have a very civil attitude, and when my hon. friends are speaking, I let them do so without interruptions. I therefore ask them to be quiet and tactful and to let me speak.

I was saying that for the Social Credit Party, there is only one solution, and that is compensated discount. What does compensated discount mean? It means additional purchasing power. With this additional purchasing power, the consumer can meet a greater number of his needs, which means a greater demand for the producer and more work to meet this demand. This is quite logical!

In these days, production is not a problem. Here is the proof. In spite of an average unemployment rate of 10 per cent or more in the labour force, we produce so much that there are surpluses. The true problem is consumption, but unfortunately taxes, levies and commitments of all sorts reduce the purchasing power of consumers. And when less is consumed, surpluses accumulate, and this results in unemployment.

In 1974, 1975 and 1976, there have been complaints that unemployment will cost the state \$4 or \$5 billion. Why not have a more human and more realistic program while providing work for the unemployed and making them do profitable work, like building senior citizen or low income housing, helping farmers, building roads, since we know that we all need roads, protecting wildlife and cleaning our beaches. I come from the Gaspé Peninsula, where there are beautiful beaches. Unfortunately, the tides often leave behind them seaweeds and uprooted plants that naturally mar their beauty. Our unemployed, who are paid to do nothing, could easily be sent there where, doing useful and pleasant work, they would regain their dignity.

If the government really wants to fight inflation, it must take whatever steps are necessary to make sure that Canadian workers do not lose their taste for work, and keep their pride and dignity. You do not increase production and develop a country by paying men and women to twiddle their thumbs. The surest way of killing a human being, morally or physically, is to pay him to remain idle. Those then, Mr. Speaker, are ways of reducing unemployment and allowing the unemployed to build instead of destroy. If such an idea can be applied by good governments, I am convinced the result will be marvellous and for the betterment of all Canadians.

The government would be killing two birds with one stone: it would stave off inflation and gild Canadian patriotism manew. That, Mr. Speaker, is the objective of the party I represent.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

Adjournment Debate

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—REDUCTION IN FARM BROADCASTING—POSITION OF MINISTER

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak tonight because there is something seriously wrong with CBC farm programming, and especially with its radio farm news coverage. First the quantity of broadcasting hours has been diminishing gradually but steadily over the years. In Toronto at station CBL the reduction of air time has been 50 per cent in the last ten years. Second, the quality of broadcasting has suffered a similar fate. Coverage of major agricultural events has diminished or disappeared, replaced by quasi agricultural matters under the guise of farm broadcasting. Third, I believe there is a personnel problem. At one time not very long ago the CBC farm staff was absolutely outstanding. Because of a series of policy changes, according to my information, the CBC has lost some excellent people and the morale, among those remaining, is at an all time low.

● (2200)

Finally the CBC, in my opinion, because possibly of its emphasis on decentralization has ignored its national responsibility. I do not quarrel particularly with the need to develop regional broadcasting. What the corporation has overlooked is the value of a national farm perspective.

Many aspects of agriculture in the prairies, for example, have a direct effect on the farm producers of my area of Perth-Wilmot. May I quote the recent bulletin of the Canadian Broadcasting League which outlined the Canadian Federation of Agriculture's position in this regard:

The loss of a national thrust to agricultural programming is very unfortunate when there is such an urgent need for national understanding and federal-provincial co-operation to make national policies and programs effective.

On February 27, because of a steadily increasing number of complaints across Canada, I asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) what he was doing with respect to restoring CBC radio farm news broadcasting to a reasonable level, in terms of both quality and quantity. The minister in reply said in part:

I think it is deplorable that they—the CBC—are curtailing farm broadcasting especially in the Toronto area.

While I do not always agree with the Minister of Agriculture, I certainly am in complete accord with him on this issue. In my opinion the CBC has abrogated its responsibilities in terms of its obligation not only to farm listeners but to many thousands of city dwellers as well who are keenly interested in agricultural issues because of their importance in today's economy.

Therefore, also on February 27, I asked the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner), to whom the CBC is responsible, if he favoured that corporation's policy, that is, the downgrading and gradual elimination of radio farm news, because the CBC regards such programs as "ghetto" broadcasting, according to some press reports. The Secretary of State in reply suggested I raise the matter with CBC officials when they bring their estimates before the appropriate standing committee and I certainly intend to do just that; however, as the Secretary of State knows full well, when we are studying such estimates in committee we do not have the time to examine, in sufficient detail, CBC broadcasting policies. We are lucky if we have any more