

addition to seeded acres, for summer fallow, that is neutral in my opinion. We believe, after much discussion with producers, that the percentage that goes to summer fallow is reasonable when balanced with what is paid on an acre of seeded crop. If we pay on all cultivated acres, it is production neutral. The farmer will get assistance if he does seed a crop and he will get assistance if he does not seed a crop.

The simple answer to the Hon. Member's question is yes, it is helpful as far as the OECD is concerned. I think the Hon. Member can understand that the answer is yes, subsidies that do not encourage production are acceptable.

Although that is taken into consideration when we decide what to do to support farmers, it is certainly not the main consideration. We do our very best to establish policies we think will be helpful to Canadian producers and at the same time bear in mind their international consequences. The main concern is with what goes on domestically.

Very briefly, in response to the question about the WGSA, producers who applied to join prior to July 31, 1987, last crop year, then will also have more benefits under the amendments we are proposing than they would have had without the amendments. Everyone that joins the plan under the amendments will be eligible for benefits for the 1987-88 crop year. We are not looking at bringing them into full participation in the first year, but it is quite attractive and does not have a 10 per cent penalty. There are some things in the present Act that we can use to make joining quite attractive to producers presently outside the program. The proof of how attractive it is, is that we anticipate it could result in the distribution of another \$80 million to \$100 million to people presently outside the plan.

• (1250)

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall I report the resolution?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Mayer: thereupon moved that Bill C-108, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending March 31, 1988, be read the first time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

Mr. Mayer: thereupon moved that Bill C-108, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending March 31, 1988, be read the second time and referred to Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Paproski in the chair.

On Clause 2—\$803,903,000 granted for 1987-88.

Supply

Mr. Foster: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have a copy of the Bill? I think it would be nice if the Minister had one, too, since he is carrying the Bill.

I would like to ask the Minister if he could tell us what date the cheques will be sent out to farmers for the first two-thirds of the payments under the Special Canadian Grains Program?

I would also like to ask if the same kind of appeal arrangements will be available under this Bill as were available last year so that farmers who are not satisfied with the decision regarding payment will be able to appeal to a body of their peers? Will the same or strengthened arrangements be provided in that regard?

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to provide the information. The application forms for people living outside the Wheat Board region were in the mail last week. We anticipate initial payments in the Wheat Board region, and I think the Hon. Member understands the difference because we are using Wheat Board figures out of permit books on the initial payments for the Wheat Board area, being in the mail February 26. We anticipate the initial payment for the other parts of the country being in the mail and in producers' hands prior to the end of March. The final payments will be out at the end of May, the beginning of June, basically the same time frame as last year.

As to whether we will be using an advisory committee, the answer is yes. This is not really an appeal process. The advisory committee will not be the final arbitrator. It will look at individual cases, get the facts, make its best judgment and, on that basis, make recommendations to the Government on how to proceed. The advisory committee was a very useful committee last year and it will be used on the same basis for the present program.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Chairman, I still do not have a copy of the Bill. I was given another Bill. I assume the Chairman of the Committee has a copy. I think at least one Member on each side of the House should have a copy of the Bill before us so we know what we are approving. We have the Estimates and that is fine.

While that is being provided, I wonder if the Minister can clarify something. It was my understanding that we had more than an advisory committee last year. We had an actual appeal committee. If a decision was made that a farmer felt was unjust, he could appeal the decision.

Mr. Hawkes: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. There has been a little bit of confusion about provision of the Bill. I wonder if we might just have unanimous consent not to see the clock so we can finish things before the normal hour of adjournment?

The Deputy Chairman: Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.