

the consumer should have to pay for it. That is the theme of the Green Paper, *Growing Together*.

There is, of course, a great deal of overlap in these areas of cost cutting. For example, how does the government eliminate or reduce the services? In the last session of Parliament we had a number of examples, including the reduction in meat inspection services and the reduction in services of the inspection of seeds that are being sold into the market. The cost of that is passed on to somebody else, or the service is no longer offered. In the case of meat inspection, the service almost disappeared, although the abattoirs, the packers, the processors are supposed to pick it up themselves.

The government has passed on a number of expenditures which used to be part of its expenditures in agriculture. This insurance change is one of them. The cost of this insurance is passed on to the provincial government and ultimately to the farmer or to the taxpayers in the provinces. It no longer appears as a cost to the government. The increase in levies in stabilization programs is another example of cost passed on to the farmer or the taxpayer.

The municipalities, by the very process, have also taken on a certain amount of the costs which were previously federal government responsibility. Every time a rail line is abandoned in Canada, the roads must take up the traffic. That is a cost to the municipalities and provinces due to the increased traffic and maintenance on the roads.

• (1200)

A portion of the cost for branchline rehabilitation, elimination and abandonment and freight assistance has been transferred to municipal governments and of course, the farmer himself has taken up a major portion of the cost which used to be a cost to the federal government. Some of these are the inspection of meat and seed, the operations of the Grain Commission and fuel taxes. Farmers used to get a rebate of the taxes they paid on fuel. That rebate will disappear entirely before the end of the year.

The stabilization levies have been increased, particularly to western farmers. The interest on advance payments used to be picked up by the federal government. That program made it possible for the farmer to bridge the period of time when he needs funds and is unable to deliver any crop he may have left in the bin. The farmer

Government Orders

was able to get some money in order to pay his bills. Again in the spring, when it is on occasion impossible to get to the bin, the farmer can get some advance payments to tide him over.

The GST is another thing that is going to increase costs to the farmer. The government has passed some of the costs on to the banks, multinationals and trust corporations in the whole process of credit. The government is removing itself very effectively from the credit structure relative to farms, putting it in the hands of the multinational banks and trust corporations, and forcing the farmer to deal with them instead, to their detriment in most cases. There is a continuing abandonment to the market. In fact the whole of the paper *Growing Together* is aimed at making the agricultural industry much more market oriented.

One of the real dangers to the farm community in this process the government is perpetrating on it is that it is insidious, disjointed and all pervasive. It goes under many names and you cannot recognize it in all cases. You have to look at it very carefully. It goes under the suggestion that you leave it to the market, that you are developing a sustainable economy, that it is a consultative process, that it is cost sharing, that it is cost cutting, or deficit reduction. In every case it is an attack on the income security of the producer. That sounds Draconian and ominous, but it is an attack; a war.

The minister has stated that the seven task forces—and that also sounds like a war—from the Green Paper will report and that when consensus has been reached the government will act. That in itself has an ominous sound because if the government acts on each of these separately as consensus is reached within that task force, it will be making a decision on a very small part of the concerns of agriculture. In the process it is not looking at the effect of those decisions or that action on the rest of the industry.

All fronts, to again use war terminology, will be treated separately. The farmer is expected to protect himself on all of these fronts at the same time. The government is refusing to pay to assist the farmer to protect himself in these task forces. If you want to be represented in the task force you have to find the money to be there. The cost for a farmer funded organization to be represented at all stages of the hearings would be from \$25,000 to \$50,000.