

If I as a member of parliament am critical of the manner in which the subsidy is paid, it is also my responsibility to suggest alternative courses. First, if you are to interfere with the market place you ought to establish a guaranteed price to the producer. The difference between the actual going price and the guaranteed price ought to be paid directly to the producer. Second, although not all grades were covered in the initial announcement, I commend the government for moving in the direction of covering all grades. That was a good move. Third, you must allow the North American market as a whole over the long term to establish a balance between supply and demand. The government cannot afford to create a strictly Canadian market. We are a country of only 22 million people. The beef producers of this country are interested in the Canadian market as well as in the international market. In that sense, I submit we should only act after consultation and negotiation with the Americans. We can ill-afford to cut ourselves off from a market of 240 million people. The beef industry needs the North American market as a whole.

Fourth, as we have learned, any attempt to freeze the price of a commodity such as beef is totally unrealistic. You cannot apply such a freeze to the beef industry. Attempts to freeze prices per se lead to disaster, as has been demonstrated. In short, you will meet the problem of the importation of American beef to Canada through a joint agreement between the two countries and not by putting up barriers and tariff walls to which I am basically opposed. You must move in the direction of a reciprocal, two-way quota system which will operate between the two countries in the direction of an overall agreement which will allow so many head of American cattle to come to Canada and so many head of Canadian cattle to go to the American market. The agreement must be based on the share of the market which each country's industry has enjoyed in the last five years.

Finally, I predict that if the American cattle industry again uses DES in the rearing of cattle, the government will restrict importation; it will go almost as far as closing the border. This will drive up the price on the Canadian market. That will happen within the next six weeks. It is a whole new kettle of fish for the government. They ought to attempt in every possible way to get the American government to outlaw the use of DES in the United States, or within the next six weeks the government will be outlawing so many American cattle that it will have closed off the Canadian border.

Mr. Charles Turner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the beef program is designed to improve the returns of beef producers which have been too low due in large measure to government action in the United States. The results of this action are still being felt by producers in this country. With the subsidy now in effect, Canadian producers marketing A, B and C cattle are receiving market price plus five cents per pound. On the basis of today's prices, Canadian producers are receiving a price about \$10 per hundredweight above the price prevailing in the United States. With respect to the producer, the payment of subsidy is quite simple. The producer receives the subsidy at the time of sale, either in

Adjournment Debate

the sale price or added to the price, if the sale price does not include the premium.

The changes the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) announced last weekend have improved the situation considerably, and the strengthening of market prices this week reflect this improvement. The hon. member opposite will be pleased to note that the number of cattle entering Canada from the United States has dropped off dramatically since the introduction of this much needed program. The producer has always had to decide whether or not he was satisfied with the price he was being offered for his animals. There is no difference now. The producer simply has to satisfy himself that he is getting the \$5 per hundredweight on his eligible cattle.

In conclusion, if the hon. member opposite or any hon. member has any evidence of anyone misusing or trying to take advantage of this program, the Minister of Agriculture would appreciate its being brought to his attention at once.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS—EDMONTON—REASON FOR REPORTED PURCHASE BY GOVERNMENT OF HOLY REDEEMER COLLEGE

Mr. Dan Hollands (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, April 2, I put the following question to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), as reported at page 1069 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. In view of the fact the government has reportedly purchased the Holy Redeemer College which lies on the southern outskirts of the city of Edmonton, would the minister tell the House what the government intends to do with this institution?

Your Honour saw fit to rule the question out of order at that time but was gracious enough to suggest that it be raised at the time of adjournment. This matter was first made known to the people of the area by way of a newspaper article some two weeks ago in the city of Edmonton. That report stated that the Holy Redeemer College was to be used as a minimum security institution. Needless to say, the residents of the area were deeply concerned by this report, particularly as they had no previous knowledge of such an intention and had been given no opportunity to make their views or wishes known.

The location of this college is among some of the finest residences and is a totally residential community adjacent to the city of Edmonton. Many of the residents have purchased or built homes of very substantial value, and in my opinion they have cause to be concerned by the appearance of a report such as I have described. The value of properties in the area would obviously be adversely affected and the quiet way of life the residents enjoy would be jeopardized.

● (2220)

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, a very disturbing aspect of this question came to my attention only yesterday. I had every intention of raising this matter on Tuesday, April 2, the day on which I put the question and the day on which Your Honour advised me that it might be raised at the time of adjournment. The reason I did not raise it on Tuesday night was simply that the minister advised me it would be better for me to delay my question because he