

*Oral Questions*

## APPLICATION TO RATES OF RESTRAINT GUIDELINES

**Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw):** Madam Speaker, I want to repeat the question asked by the Hon. Member for Mackenzie. I am addressing it to the Minister responsible for Economic Development. Why did the Government not stick to its six and five program when it came to increases in the rates?

**Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology):** Madam Speaker, the fact is—

**Mr. Blenkarn:** Answer it.

**Mr. Johnston:** Let us look at the facts. They are that the basic Crow benefit, the gap in 1982-83, is being paid to the grain producers and, in fact, there is no inflationary increase in the current period. The increase next year will be 3 per cent which is lower than 6 per cent or 5 per cent; the following year it will be 3 per cent, which is lower than 6 per cent or 5 per cent; and the following year it will be 3 per cent, which is lower than 6 per cent or 5 per cent—

**Some Hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Johnston:** It would be wonderful if that is the rate of inflation at that time. In fact, beginning in 1986, the grain producers will be required to pick up the first six percentage points. Let us hope that it is not that high if our campaign is successful, as it appears to be. But they will be required to pick up the first six percentage points which has an historical basis in terms of Canadian inflationary experience. Therefore, I would suggest that the program is very much in keeping—

**Madam Speaker:** Order. The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw.

● (1500)

## EFFECT OF ACREAGE PAYMENT ON GRAIN GROWERS

**Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw):** Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. I am rather confused, because the Government's own documents indicate that between 1982-83 to 1985-86, a four year period, the net increase to the grain producer will be from \$4.89 a tonne to \$9.35 a tonne. In less than four years there will be an increase of 91.20 per cent.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Neil:** That does not sound like six and five should.

The other question I have is with respect to the proposed acreage payment. Has the Government conducted a study to determine what effect this acreage payment will have on the grain producer? I understand that the acreage payment program is to be spread around all the producers and the impact will be upon those people who presently benefit from the Crow rate. Has a study been done on this aspect, and will the Minister agree to table such a study?

**Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology):** Madam Speaker, I am not in a position to say specifically

what studies are available on the subject, but I can assure the Hon. Member that there was an enormous amount of deliberation and study by everyone, including Mr. Gilson, in terms of proposing a regime which would have a beneficial effect not only on the grain producer but also on the whole agricultural economy in western Canada, with the capacity of that economy to diversify and also with the incentive, if you like, which will be injected in that economy, which will enable the rail transportation system itself to be modernized and to become more effective and efficient. That is the underlying reason for this initiative, which is widely supported by everyone familiar with the bottlenecks and difficulties which have arisen in the past with respect to the transportation of grain in western Canada.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

TABLING OF REPORT OF COMMISSION FOR THE PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK, 1983

**Madam Speaker:** In accordance with Section 19 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, Chapter E-2 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, I have the duty to table an authentic copy of the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of New-Brunswick, 1983.

As Hon. Members will know, Standing Order 46(4) provides that the reports laid before the House in accordance with an Act of Parliament are deemed to have been permanently referred to the Committee designated by the member tabling the report. In this case, I suggest that the report be deferred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. However, the statute under which the Electoral Boundaries Commission submit their reports to the House determines the procedure to be followed with regard to these reports.

\* \* \*

[English]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISPOSITION OF STRIKING COMMITTEE REPORT

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** Madam Speaker, last week the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) asked me if we would be designating an Opposition day this week and I told him that I would do so at the beginning of this week. I would now like to designate Friday of this week as an Opposition day.

[Translation]

At the same time, since it is important for the Committees to become operational as soon as possible in accordance with the new rules, the Hon. Member for London-East (Mr. Turner) yesterday tabled a report concerning the striking of