COMMONS DEBATES

when the Minister has offered \$100 million a year in compensation to the provinces for anticipated increases in the cost of drugs?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it will take too much of Question Period to explain all of that.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Andre: I hope the Hon. Member was careful in his use of language when he talked about cost to the provinces. I hope he was careful to listen to what I have been saying all along, that the price of drugs will not go up by a penny.

Mr. Frith: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. Andre: If he thinks about it for a little while, maybe he will understand.

Mr. Frith: You don't understand the Bill.

Mr. Rossi: You never understood it.

[Translation]

### **ENERGY**

DEREGULATION—INQUIRY WHETHER QUEBEC NATURAL GAS CONSUMERS WILL BENEFIT FROM LOWER PRICES AT SAME TIME AS OTHER PROVINCES

Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. The Minister announced on November 1 of this year that natural gas prices will be deregulated, arguing that this would be beneficial to Canadian consumers.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary give the House the assurance that manufacturing industries and consumers in Quebec will benefit from a reduction in the price of natural gas at the same time as the other provinces?

[English]

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, deregulation went into effect on November 1 which allowed buyer and seller to negotiate the price of natural gas freely without Government intervention. This added competition and supply should result in lower prices to all consumers in Canada and a better deal for the producers.

Privilege-Mr. Domm

## **AGRICULTURE**

#### EFFECTIVENESS OF AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture who is aware that many farmers from Eston, Saskatchewan, have been trying for five years to get \$1 million in damages from Dow Chemical over the use of the chemical Tordon 202C which proved ineffective and damaging to their crops. In 1980 Dow Chemical said that the problem appears "to be that our present formulation, even at the high rate of application, does not give adequate control of volunteer rape seed, stink weed or wild mustard".

What plans does the Minister have for more effective policing of agricultural chemicals which are not performing as claimed on their labels?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I take the Hon. Member's question seriously. I take it more in the form of a representation. I must confess that I am not fully aware of all the details in this case. This is a representation which is not made all that often. I know that there were a series of problems prior to the Government's decision to change the labelling of chemicals. That has eliminated and alleviated a good number of problems.

# REQUEST THAT DEPARTMENT MONITOR FARMERS' COMPLAINTS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell the House whether he is ready to make some changes so that complaints from farmers about farm chemicals can be monitored and evaluated by his Department rather than requiring farmers to go through very expensive court procedures against huge multinationals?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the short answer to that question is yes. We are always anxious to change policies and programs for the better. This case may well require a change or amendment to the appropriate legislation. We will study that. The answer to the Hon. Member's question is definitely yes.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to advise Hon. Members that I have received notice of several questions of privilege which I will proceed to now.

## **PRIVILEGE**

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—COMMITTEE DECISION ON VOTABLE ITEMS

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege affects every Member in the House and the very nature of Parliament. The reasons given to the House of Commons and the press for rejection of various private