

*S. O. 31*

ment of the day outlined a long-term policy to get the national government out from under every transportation assistance program. Their main claim to infamy was the destruction of the statutory grain rates, and grain producers are going to get hit every year with higher freight costs because of that.

At a time when grain prices are going down and when we are having our most serious difficulties with the United States and the European Economic Community, surely is not a time to be making our grain producers pay more to reduce the capacity and effectiveness of our grain handling and flour milling systems to compete in a relative degree of equity with other countries.

If there is any one thing that I cannot understand, it is why this government, and previous ones, have continually resorted to attacking our primary producers for every nickel this federal government has sent out to western grain and agriculture producers across Canada. It has hit them with higher taxes, higher prices or higher costs that are in excess of any assistance sent by this government to agricultural producers.

I have already illustrated that over three years, the last fiscal year, this one and the next one, those increased costs and levies will amount to \$1.677 billion on agricultural producers and their infrastructure which depends on them. That is not what you could call sound business practices. That is not what you could call treating the whole country fairly. It would be nice if we could produce all our grain in Atlantic Canada and British Columbia. We would not have to worry about the kinds of costs that we are faced with out west.

I do not know how many times I have had to get up in this Chamber and talk on this subject since 1968. I do not know what one has to do to get the government members to reconsider and change their minds. If they would even do it once on some of these programs it would be a nice change. It would be refreshing.

All I can do on behalf of my party is appeal to the government to reconsider and withdraw this bill. If it insists on going through with it, will it do what is asked for as a compromise, a last resort, by people in Atlantic Canada to make sure that they do not have to pay any more freight rates than they do up as far as Montreal?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member's time has expired. He will have 10 minutes for his questions and comments, should we continue this debate after three o'clock.

It being two o'clock, the House will now proceed to Statements by Members pursuant to Standing Order 31.

---

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[English]

### WOMEN'S CENTRES

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, the women of Canada are still waiting for action from this government. The destruction of core funding for women's centres has been a cruel blow. Women who work to assist other women through these centres have lost all sense of security. They do not know whether their rent will be paid, whether their heat will be paid, or whether they will have light to do their work by. This government has abdicated its responsibility and left thousands of women without crucial services.

The Secretary of State has met with many of these groups, and so has the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, but weeks have passed and nothing has changed.

The lot of women in this country is not improving. In every area we see barriers, inequities and blatant discrimination.

Pious words do not create a climate of equality. So-called sympathy and understanding will not keep the doors of these centres open.

Core funding must be restored. Canadian women deserve these services, and the government has a duty to provide them. Fifty-two per cent of the population will not accept vague promises. They want action, and they want it now.

\* \* \*

### FISHERIES

**Mr. Peter L. McCreath (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, the recent ruling by the free trade panel on the American legislation restricting the import of what the Americans consider to be undersized lobsters potentially undermines the credibility of the redress process of the FTA itself.