

570,000 unemployed. This year, this number has grown considerably. However, unemployment is not Canada's own problem, it affects other countries, too. Why? Because modern technology is and has been moving forward.

The problem lies in the educational system. We set up schools of sociology and other somewhat "variable" sciences. We establish new departments with an enrolment of as many as 10,000 students when only 400 jobs or so a year are provided. This is how unemployment springs up by itself.

It is none of the federal government's business to go and tell the provinces what they should be doing. They are supposed to know their way around. They have become unemployment mills and I think that we should concern ourselves with this situation, even though it is not of our jurisdiction, because we are providing the funds. As a matter of fact, it would seem we are encouraging unemployment.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I sincerely regret to interrupt the Parliamentary Secretary, but his time has expired.

[*English*]

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in rising to support this motion which reads as follows:

That this House condemns the government's lack of leadership which has humiliated the disadvantaged, dislocated the finances of provinces and municipalities, and caused injury and decline to our rural communities which are already seriously damaged by the government's failure to provide adequate agricultural policies.

A few minutes ago the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) objected to a suggestion made by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) that all farm lands should be socialized, or something to that effect.

An hon. Member: He didn't say that.

Mr. Korchinski: I did not hear what the hon. member said; the objection was raised by the hon. member for Assiniboia. My point is, why is he raising this objection now? By the time the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) is finished with us through his proposed estate taxes in the white paper on taxation, the government will own them anyway. Despite all the protests he made in reading his speech, which was well prepared and documented—

An hon. Member: Are you not reading now?

Mr. Korchinski: —the Premier of Saskatchewan was interviewed over television last Sunday on the program "Question Period" and he protested that his province was not receiving proper attention with regard to the unemployment situation. He felt that the federal government was not giving Saskatchewan all that was necessary to keep the residents of the province happy.

• (9:00 p.m.)

An hon. Member: That is not what he said on Saturday night.

Mr. Korchinski: I don't know what he said on Saturday night, but I saw him on television on Sunday. I rise

Economic Conditions in Rural Communities

because last Thursday the minister responsible for the Wheat Board stated in the House that despite all the efforts made at Geneva, the International Grains Arrangement had not reached a successful conclusion. I quote some of his comments:

We wished to include price levels which would reflect adequate returns to efficient wheat producers... While it is a matter of serious regret that an agreement including pricing provisions could not be concluded we are not unduly discouraged or pessimistic over the lack of such an agreement at this time.

Perhaps the minister is not discouraged or pessimistic, but I think a lot of the farmers are discouraged or pessimistic because of the position in which they have been placed. Most farmers are familiar with the old International Wheat Agreement which served them well over the years. At least they knew there would be a basis for price stability and that anything outside the agreement would be sold as a result of other arrangements. However, because the negotiations in which this government took part covered many other commodities beside grain there was a breakdown of the International Grains Arrangement. I wish to quote from the *Star-Phoenix* of January 16, 1971, as follows:

Critics have suggested that the 1968-71 International Grains Arrangement, with its dazzling pledges of big price increases, sagged partly because negotiations were linked with huge tariff bargaining on industrial goods. The strength of the wheat agreement was reduced in exchange for industrial tariff concessions.

This underlines the fact that various concessions were given. I understand that the chemical industry was well treated as a result of this arrangement. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) was hopeful that Britain's entry into the European Common Market would not hurt us generally, although he admitted it might do so as far as agricultural products are concerned. Other factors would compensate for the loss suffered by agriculture. Having made that blunder before, I wonder whether they tried to get out of the agreement with the suggestion that the western farmer was not looked after during the negotiations. Hardly was the ink dry when prices began to slump. As a result of this slump, the last several years have been years of near-disaster for wheat producers. In fact, they have been years of disaster for many. Many farmers have pulled out of the business.

In the few minutes left to me I wish to place one or two suggestions before the House. I am disappointed that no agreement was reached at Geneva. I am disappointed because after the old agreement expired, prices dropped from around \$2.12 to \$1.70. That is a drop of around 40 cents a bushel, a serious blow to grain producers. Since the government was not successful in negotiating an agreement I think that in line with the minister's policy of maintaining a fair price the government has an obligation to introduce a reasonable two-price system—not \$1.95, the minimum under the old agreement, but a realistic figure.

An arrangement of this kind is an accomplished fact in the United States where wheat producers are assured of \$2.85 a bushel for domestically-produced wheat. Similar assistance is an accomplished fact in the ECM and in