

of the impact of this legislation upon both western grain producers and the livestock feeding industry, but nowhere in any policy statement related to this legislation or in any other announcement of intended policy has there been any measurement of the possible impact upon any part of Canada east of the Great Lakes.

As a Canadian, I demand a measurement of the impact. As a maritimer, I would ask the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) to respond to the questions contained in my remarks of May 5 as reported in *Hansard* at page 25210. They read:

—I want to know if there is any intention on the part of this Government to recognize that increment in cost which will be passed on by the change in the Crow rate as it relates to eastern Canadian poultry, hog and beef operations. We are entitled to that answer in a definitive cost study basis—

Has the Minister responded in any way to my request for a cost study analysis? As a Canadian, I demand a measurement of that. The Government, from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) through all Ministers of the Cabinet, has totally failed to recognize that a policy of Government was enunciated during World War II which was intended to make meat production competitive throughout Canada. The policy recognized that the Atlantic Provinces were not and probably never would be self-sustaining in the field of meat and poultry. The very nature of the climate and the farming enterprise in that area did not lend itself to that level of production.

The policy was to create competitive opportunity in the meat industry of Canada for all farmers then engaged in the business. A beef producer in New Brunswick could anticipate both comparable cost and return with a farmer in the same business but living in the prairie region. In order for this to become fact, it was necessary that a feed grain subsidy program be put in place.

The Government in its lack of wisdom has chosen to reduce the effective rate of this subsidy over the years. As a consequence, it has been documented that there is now a very distinct competitive advantage extended to prairie meat producers when shipping to the Atlantic market.

The Minister may consider that the maritime area is insignificant relative to other areas of Canada. No matter how small their number, they deserve to be considered as part of any national policy, and this has not happened. It has been estimated that the maritime pork producer may be at a \$4.40 per hundredweight disadvantage in pork when marketed in Atlantic Canada, versus that produced in the prairies and marketed in Atlantic Canada. The disadvantage is even larger in respect to beef produced in western Canada but marketed in the Maritimes.

The original statement of policy of the Minister of Transport was analysed by the Maritime Farmers Council. In their opinion they would find themselves in an even greater position of disadvantage than at present. It was for that reason that I asked for a cost analysis of the impact upon Atlantic livestock producers, as I mentioned earlier.

The Maritime Farmers Council made an in-depth study of the progressive loss of competitive opportunity from 1967 until 1982. The figures are startling. I hope the Government and the Minister of Transport will listen carefully. In 1967, in order to maintain a competitive position on a national basis for the

production of meat and poultry, the maritime farmer paid 11 per cent of the total cost of grain transportation when shipped to Nova Scotia. This may seem like an inordinate amount of subsidy to be extended to any industry, but that is Government policy and that industry was in place because of historic Government policy. In 1982, the maritime farmer was paying 75 per cent of the total cost of transportation, but we must bear in mind that this is a much higher cost than that of 1967. The disadvantage was further aggravated by the fact that the western farmer was paying 59 per cent of his cost of transportation in 1976 and only 18.7 per cent in 1981.

● (1710)

These figures were not just pulled out of a hat. They were based upon information obtained from the Gilson Report, Economic Council of Canada figures, the Snavely Report and gross national expenditures implicit price index. It must be recognized by the Government of Canada that this is a nation of five regions, that any policy which may be adopted for any reason may impact favourably or unfavourably upon another region of Canada. We must know whither we go when we bring in policies such as the one that is presently before us.

The continuing changes in Government policy have already virtually brought the feeding industry in the maritime Provinces to its knees. This is not the only example of failure to recognize all of Canada as policy evolves at the federal level.

I complained, and I will continue to complain, that while Chrysler, Massey-Ferguson, Bombardier and Maislin, all in Ontario and Quebec, are worthy of assistance in times of financial distress, there is still no analysis of the impact upon the eastern farm of this change in policy.

It has also been clearly pointed out by the behaviour of Treasury Board, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) and the Government at large, that agriculture is no longer an important subject matter as far as the apple grower or the potato producer of eastern Canada is concerned. The price stabilization policy has never been adjusted by effective indexing of production costs, and the payment is not announced until after the time for planting.

These are very retrograde and very thoughtless moves in Government policy. Perhaps one could be somewhat less parochial if one were to mention the shipbuilding industry. There has never been a policy which would activate the real capability of the shipyards of Canada under this Government. The lack of this policy has produced unemployment from coast to coast in Canada to the point that the shipyards are no longer paying income tax on profit. The employment has dropped as much as 90 per cent in some shipyards so the workers there are no longer paying income tax, they are drawing Unemployment Insurance or welfare at the expense of the Province.

It is a total lack of comprehension of Canada as a whole that is in evidence as one policy succeeds another, regardless of the economic sphere affected by the policy.