

I would like to break the Bill down into five areas. These areas are, first, what it does for farmers, and that is really what is important about this Bill; second, what it does for the railways; third, how the freight rates are established; fourth, the new grain transportation agency; and fifth, and I think probably what is most important, the review process. The review process will take place after the year 1985-86, so that many of the issues and concerns that are raised can be reviewed after a certain period of time. At that time, Parliament of the day can make further changes to bring about greater protection to the western producer.

These areas do not correspond exactly to the text of the Bill, but I believe that dividing it into these five categories makes it easier to understand and analyse the Bill.

First, what does the Bill do for the farmers? There is no doubt the Bill will bring about changes in the western grain transportation and handling system. There is no doubt that the farmer is being asked to pay a bit more for transportation; we are not denying that. But in return, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of provisions which work to his or her benefit.

First, again contrary to what the Hon. Member for Vegreville said this morning, there is a statutory basis for the new structure. Once the legislation is in place, only this Parliament can change it. There is very little scope for decisions by Order in Council, so farmers have the assurance of a stable and predictable system.

Second, farmers are guaranteed a permanent annual payment of over \$650 million, the famous Crow benefit. It is payable to the railways and it is payable as long as the legislation is in existence. I believe it is safe to say that as a result farmers will never have to pay the full cost of transporting their grain.

Third, farmers will receive protection from expected inflationary cost increases in the future, again contrary to what the critics in the Progressive Conservative Party attempted to tell the producers this morning. For the next three years the farmer will only be asked to pay the first three percentage points of railway cost increases. Perhaps this calls for a simple illustration, but I see, Mr. Speaker, that you have given me the nod to indicate that my time has expired. May I call it one o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

S.O. 21

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[Translation]

ENERGY

DISADVANTAGES TO QUEBEC OF PROGRESSIVE GASOLINE TAX

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): On Tuesday night, Madam Speaker, Quebec Finance Minister Parizeau refused to remove the 40 per cent automatic tax on gasoline in Quebec, even though spokesmen for businessmen and consumers had urged him to do just that. The Minister himself had acknowledged and promised that the tax was temporary and would end on March 31, 1983.

Mr. Parizeau seems to agree that the tax is unfair to people who live near our neighbouring provinces of New Brunswick and Ontario, since he has lowered the tax in the vicinity of those interprovincial boundaries. I am glad that Hull residents, for instance, will benefit from a partial tax reduction, but it is the best proof that we owe that tax aberration to a Minister who has run out of ideas.

Not satisfied with creating an unbelievable distortion of some \$200 million in Quebec's agri-food sector, as compared with Western Canada, the Minister is urging tourists to travel elsewhere in Canada. Madam Speaker, that is the way the Social Democrats conceive the economic recovery and how the separatists can be sure that none of our neighbours will come to steal our jobs.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES AT CANADIAN FORCES BASE BORDEN

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South): Madam Speaker, in my riding we have yet another example of the stupidity and duplicity involved in the implementation of the Government's new job-creation programs.

Civilians working on contract at CFB Borden, many of them with seniority, have been let go and their jobs have been offered to those on welfare, or those whose unemployment insurance benefits have expired. Yet, many in the latter group are refusing the jobs. Eight of those refusing have been cut off from welfare payments and two others, who initially refused, accepted the jobs when told their welfare payments would cease.

The social services administrator said those refusing the jobs cited transportation problems, an excuse that was not legitimate. He also said others simply avoided going to the jobs when they were referred. He stated that 30 of the 200 jobs offered have been filled, and that one man is making \$8.43 an hour washing dishes at the Base.