

Oral Questions

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, as far as I am concerned he could have gone on all day.

When the Western Grain Stabilization Act was passed we witnessed a debate on the same question as the one raised today, whether it was to be three years or five years. The decision was made at that time that five years was the better base because it co-ordinated better with other pieces of legislation in the Canadian system. Obviously that debate has gone on, and obviously each time farmers run into some kind of difficulty somebody rises and asks, "Why not the three years?" The answer is the same as the one given when the bill was introduced in the first place. I am told that this, nevertheless, is an idea which is constantly reviewed by the Government and that there is a review of this issue at this particular time being undertaken by people in the Department of Agriculture.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

COST OF FUEL TO FARMERS

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture who likes to use the words "et cetera". I once understood et cetera meant that the speaker did not have any more knowledge, but he knew there was more he should know.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: I was taking it for granted that you knew something.

Mr. Epp: In view of fuel prices—and the Minister says they are only 3 per cent of production costs—which impact on fertilizers, herbicides and costs of production, does the Minister of Agriculture favour the Government's position which now accepts that Canadians, specifically Canadian farmers, should pay more than 75 per cent of world price for their fuel?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that we have an energy policy in Canada—I could use the words et cetera, because I know he knows that very well. He knows what it amounts to and what we are trying to do with that energy program. A year ago, before world prices changed, American farmers paid more than Canadian farmers. In fact all farmers in the rest of the world paid more. He was not asking at that time, "Will you go to more than 75 per cent of world price?" or, "What will you do?" He was not saying a thing about it at that time when farmers were receiving a benefit under the program. They are not at that much of a disadvantage at the present time when one checks out all the figures.

• (1125)

SPECIAL RECOVERY PROGRAM

IDENTIFICATION OF MANITOBAN PROJECTS

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question deals with western Canada, and specifically Manitoba. It is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Of the hundred so-called recovery projects that are to be put on "fast-track, no-delays", is there any program specifically identified for western Manitoba?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, I do not have a list here of the projects that have been under consideration. I can assure the Hon. Member that these projects will be distributed all across Canada. The program will contribute to every Province and ensure that there will be employment development in each of the Provinces. The Hon. Member will have to await specific announcements to determine whether the projects are in the particular area he has mentioned.

* * *

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

CRUISE MISSILE TESTING—STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES OFFICIAL

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. A story in yesterday's *Le Devoir* quoted a highly-placed Pentagon official as saying that Canadian testing of Cruise missiles is not really necessary. This official, who has close involvement with the Geneva negotiations, says that tests of the Cruise in the United States are almost finished and further testing in Canada would change nothing. I would like to ask the Minister if he plans to take this information to Cabinet, which in turn could state its position to the Pentagon that, if testing is not necessary, then Canada will not participate.

Hon. J. Gilles Lamontagne (Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, it is well known that before this Government takes a decision with regard to testing the Cruise missile, every allegation will be taken into consideration. The Prime Minister is in Washington. I suppose there was some discussion there about this. If we have a request from the United States, the appropriate steps will be taken by Cabinet in reaching a decision.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST POSSIBLE TESTING

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Madam Speaker, given the fact that hundreds of thousands of Canadians have taken to the streets, and more will do the same this Sunday in Ottawa, to protest the proposed testing of the Cruise missile in Canada, and in light of the fact that this missile represents a backward step in attempts to negotiate verifiable arms control