

Canada meat producers by 1992, that is a difference of \$20 million for an amount of over \$9 billion. Therefore, that is a difference of only about one half of 1 per cent.

I must say that, in spite of all these projections and all the discussions that have taken place, the fear and suspicion spread by the Quebec Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Garon), first among the major Quebec farmers' organizations, and then among a large number of Quebec farm producers, has considerably inflamed a debate which should have been pragmatic, sensible and objective.

It is obvious that if Quebec producers had seen the Federal Government implement all of the recommendations contained in the Gilson report, they would have felt wronged and the survival of their farming operations would have been affected sooner or later. However, many farming interests in Canada has serious reservations concerning the method of payment.

Anxious to carry out his great project and fundamental reform, the Minister of Transport chose to tone it down and to bring about a reform which might not be as marvelous and as perfect as he would have wished, but which is still most significant and essential and will still achieve the main purpose of changing the Crow rate, improving railway transportation in Western Canada and promoting some agricultural diversification and extensive trade development in Western Canada.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is wrong to claim, as some Progressive Conservative Members have done—and I am thinking about the reactions of the Hon. Members for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) and Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) who objected to the comments made by the Minister of Transport yesterday, saying that these changes were made only as a result of the representations of Quebec members and that the reform is not as satisfactory as it would have been under the original Gilson formula. This proposal was indeed changed because of the representations made by Quebec Members, but also because of all the representations made by many Western farmers' organizations which objected to the payments being made to the producers and also suggested that the entire amount be paid to the railways.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Minister, but his time has expired.

[*English*]

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Mr. Speaker I appreciate the remarks made by the Hon. Minister. He suggested that the original payment proposal outlined by his colleague, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin), would not meet with the satisfaction of producers in his Province. I do not think I have to remind—

**Mr. Chrétien:** And in the West.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** I will ask the question, not the Hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien).

I do not think I have to remind the Hon. Minister that some strong views are held on the proposal that the Minister has advanced in this particular Bill. Having regard to that and knowing the Minister to be a reasonable person who recognizes

### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

the difficulties and the differences of view across the country, how would he react to the proposal that I advanced yesterday which would give the producers the freedom to choose whether the Crow benefit should be paid to the railroads or to the producers?

The Minister has acknowledged that the whole question of method of payment would be reviewed by 1985-86. This review would provide an opportunity to test both systems and to receive some practical knowledge as to how both proposals might work. I recognize that the principle I am outlining has not been worked out in detail, but could the Minister give us some indication about what his reaction might be to a proposal such as that?

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker, I was present yesterday when the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) gave his speech. One thing that attracted my attention was that he said that the Bill is very complicated and that it is a bureaucratic nightmare, if I remember his expression correctly. I must say that the administration of his suggestion could turn out to be a terrible bureaucratic nightmare as well. I believe the Hon. Member will agree that his proposal must be looked at much more carefully and in depth before it can be considered. I do appreciate that the Hon. Member will be provided with a good opportunity to outline and explain how he would like his proposal to be administered when the Bill goes to committee.

My first reaction to the Hon. Member's proposal is that it seems to me it would be almost impossible to apply such a formula. I would indicate to him that obviously the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Alberta Wheat Pool, the Manitoba pool elevator, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, and Unifarm of Alberta, have all expressed the view that payment should be made to the railway. I believe that these are important associations in the West and, along with other important associations in the East, they have felt that the simplest method at this time would be to make the payment to the railway.

I believe that we must progress step by step. I think the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) would like to take a giant step. I suspect his Bill is a big step, and I believe that it is a big step in the right direction. I would not like to see this step shortened by an administrative formula or procedure such as the one suggested by the Hon. Member, one that could not be applied and that would make the big step taken by the Minister seem almost irrelevant.

● (1250)

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Mr. Speaker, it is correct that I referred to the Bill as a bureaucratic nightmare. Implicit in that statement is the fact that there will be a huge bureaucracy, a huge network to administer it. So a whole lot is being added. The original proposal provided for a payment which would be split, 50 per cent to the producers and 50 per cent to the railways, under some form of acreage payments yet to be