

Government which will simply never let the left hand know what the right hand is doing.

The Government moves to this great universal program and does it at exactly the same time it is reviewing, with a view to eliminating, the Maritime Freight Rates Act and the Atlantic Region Freight Rates Assistance Act. A manufacturer in St. John's, Newfoundland, will pay 26.4 per cent more to move his competitive product into Montreal; 24.9 per cent to Ottawa; 22.3 per cent to Toronto. Because of economies of scale the further he goes the cheaper it is, and he will wind up paying only about 10 per cent more to get it into Vancouver. His market is in Montreal, Toronto, in the heartland where the buyers are. These figures are on the basis of the removal of the basic 30 per cent subsidy, which in fact is already a reduction in the carrier's published rates. There is no relationship whatsoever to what in fact is charged or what in fact it costs.

The shipper will pay 24.6 per cent more to ship from Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, to Montreal; to Ottawa, 22.5 per cent; to Toronto, 19.3 per cent. And so it goes across the country, reducing to about 8 per cent to get to Vancouver. You have, for example, in my own metropolitan urban area of Halifax, a 22.9 per cent increase in the cost of every manufactured product we have to send to the central market in order to survive. That is what we are going to achieve. I have the figures here and my friend from the north shore of the river knows it.

**Mr. Breau:** Baie Comeau.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Baie Comeau.

**Mr. Maltais:** Where Mulroney will not run.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Brian Mulroney will run in Baie Comeau and my friend will welcome it because he will go to the Senate. He is not worried about it.

I have more figures, Mr. Speaker. It will be 26.4 per cent more from St. John's, Newfoundland; 25 per cent from Corner Brook; 24.6 per cent from Yarmouth; Sydney, 24 per cent; Halifax, 22.9 per cent; Charlottetown, 22.5 per cent; Moncton, 21 per cent; Bathurst, 20 per cent; Edmundston, 15 per cent.

I will tell you what are the figures resulting from the removal of the basic 30 per cent and the additional 20 per cent subsidy on selected commodities which applies as a reduction from the carrier's published tariffs. Let someone over there tell me what the relationship between the right hand of Government and the left hand is.

When you include both the selected commodity rate and the MFRA rate, from St. John's, Newfoundland it is 26.4 per cent under the basic rate; 53.4 per cent when you include both; from Corner Brook it is 50.5 per cent; from Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, 49 per cent; from Sydney, 47.6 per cent; from Halifax, 45.1 per cent; from Charlottetown, 44.1 per cent; from Moncton, 40.3 per cent; from Bathurst, 38.4 per cent; and from Edmundston, 27.8 per cent. That is just into Montreal. What manufacturer, processor or producer can afford that kind of

### *Government Organization Act, 1983*

impact? Does the Government not communicate from department to department? Is it not clear that while there are enormous benefits to be gained for this nation in what is proposed, in fact you are allowing another branch of Government to undermine all of that good?

We do not have a lot of time left today, Mr. Speaker, and I am not at all that certain about how interested most Members are, but I want to very quickly go through some selected comments with respect to the impact of the Government's proposed action with respect to the MFRA.

The Atlantic Provinces Chamber of Commerce urged retention and strengthening of the program. The source for that was their annual meeting in Digby, Nova Scotia, on May 30, 1983, according to the *Telegraph-Journal* and *Chronicle-Herald* of June 1. Atlantic Canada Plus, one of our successful programs, said:

Any reduction in freight subsidies will have severe repercussions on business here. Withdrawing the subsidies is then one of the most ill-conceived blows against Atlantic industry.

That was a statement by Harvey Webber, the president, as reported in several newspapers in late May of this year.

The Canadian Manufacturer's Association passed a resolution urging the federal Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) to guarantee the intent of the subsidy program, and that additional assistance be provided, if necessary, to meet the intent of the program. That was reported in a number of newspapers.

The Maritime Lumber Bureau passed a resolution urging retention and expansion of assistance programs.

The Annapolis Valley Affiliated Boards of Trade have stated they support efforts:

—to hold off any reduction in transportation subsidies paid to Atlantic area businessmen to help them compete.

The New Brunswick Federation of Labour said:

—more plant closures will follow elimination of the transport assistance programs.

The Pictou County Research and Development Commission

Many of our local industries may not be able to absorb the higher costs if the complete removal of these subsidies is implemented which will result in higher transportation costs—

That was from a statement by Bill MacCulloch, executive director, as reported in the *Chronicle-Herald* of May 3, and also June 7, 1983. Yes, shrug your shoulders. It does not matter a damn to you, does it, my friend from the St. Lawrence River? Not a damn.

The Maritime Farmers Council—laugh at them Minister, if you will—passed a resolution urging that the assistance program be retained and strengthened.

The Voluntary Planning organization said:

—companies would have a tough time operating and probably find it was more advantageous to shut down.

Is that what you want to do, get rid of jobs?

● (1850)

The resolution of the Canadian Industrial Traffic League, Atlantic division, was as follows: