around and grabbed some more. He pulled another 0.5 cents out of the pockets of Canadians. Canadians are becoming aware of the realities of the gas industry in Canada. For instance, they know that Canadian companies are selling gasoline to American companies at seven cents to nine cents a litre less than what they are selling it to Canadian gasoline stations. Thus we have a situation in which gasoline stations a quarter of a mile apart, but on different sides of the border, are selling gasoline at seven cents to nine cents a litre less than what it is being sold for in Canada. This gasoline being sold in American gas stations close to the Canadian border is gasoline which is coming from the same Canadian supplier. Hundreds of thousands of Canadians are driving across the border to fill up their tanks. That hurts Canadian gasoline retailers through the loss of business.

Last weekend members of my riding association and myself distributed a number of letters to shopping malls in the community of Thunder Bay. Another quantity of letters was mailed to the community of Atikokan. They call upon concerned Canadians to respond in writing in the form of a petition. The letters went out on Friday night and Saturday morning and were designed as a mail-back. Today, which is the first day on which we could expect to receive mail back after a weekend pick-up, we had over 85 replies. That type of volume received that quickly indicates the concerns which Canadians have with respect to this matter, particularly Canadians in the riding of Thunder Bay-Atikokan.

I now wish to turn for a moment to a system which ensures the viability of the community of Thunder Bay, the Port of Thunder Bay and communities throughout eastern Canada. I refer to the St. Lawrence Seaway. At a time when the Welland Canal was involved in an unfortunate accident, which may or may not relate to the quality of maintenance and the structural integrity of the facility, we find that the Government of Canada is reducing the amount of money available to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority for the ongoing maintenance of that facility. In 1984-85, the Authority spent $13.5 million. In 1985-86, it spent $13.15 million. What is the Government's plan in terms of spending for 1986-87? It plans to spend $10.657 million—a reduction of over $2 million. When we are so concerned about viability I would have thought that there would have been assurances that the money would be there to ensure that the facility, whether it be for the Welland Canal or other components of it, would remain in a structurally sound condition in order to continue operations. However, the Government does not seem to care about that at all.

One area which I had hoped the Minister of Finance would address was with respect to the need for a major municipal rebuild program. This is a matter I have raised in the House a number of times, as did representatives of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities in meetings which they had with the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald) and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan). The federation conducted a study about two years ago, the results of which showed that Canadian municipalities are deteriorating at a rapid rate.

The study also showed that in order to protect what exists today $14 billion would have to be invested in our roads, bridges, sewers and waterlines just to protect our investment. The study was conducted in terms of the impact of that type of expenditure. It was found that anywhere from 222,000 to 285,000 jobs would be created as a result of such an investment. It was also found that anywhere from 84,000 to 91,000 jobs would be created in terms of the actual construction of projects and that 42,000 to 73,000 jobs would be created in the manufacturing sector if such an investment were undertaken. These are figures which I feel show quite clearly how one can invest money to create employment and services to protect an investment which is already in place. I suppose the Government was scared off by the $14 billion figure.

The federation conducted a further study. I would ask Hon. Members to keep in mind that such an investment program would be a tri-level program involving federal, provincial and municipal Governments. It would be a program in which everyone would pay their fair share. The federation estimated that of this $14 billion $8 billion would be recovered from the initial expenditures through improved economic activity. Thus the net cost to be shared between the three levels of Government would be $6 billion. An important fact to consider is that the facilities would be in place for years.

We often hear in the House a great concern with respect to the deficit. Conservative Members would like us to believe that their attempts of reducing the deficit are made so that our children do not have to pay for it. The reality is that if we do not move quickly enough to rebuild our cities now, our children will have to pay for that rebuilding. They will have to pay 10 times what it would cost today to provide replacement facilities.

The other topic I wish to touch upon is the area of cost recovery. Following in the footsteps of the previous administration the Government is moving more and more into the area of cost recovery and user-pay. In this respect I refer Hon. Members to page 4 of the ***Budget Papers*** where Table 1 is set out. It is entitled "Gross Impact of Expenditure Reduction Measures Undertaken Since the Fall of 1984". The table sets out some interesting figures. For example, between the 1985-86 and 1986-87 budget years cost recovery will increase by 3 per cent. Between the 1986-87 and 1987-88 budget years it will increase by 41 per cent. Between 1987-88 and 1990-91 it will rise by 26 per cent. That is a 245 per cent increase in the amount of money to be collected from users. Some people will say that if they use it then perhaps they should pay for it.

In committee we have been dealing with Bill C-75, which is a Bill to amend the Canada Shipping Act. One of the chief components of the Bill is a cost-recovery scheme for the Coast Guard. In discussions with the marine industry, we found that of the fees paid to the Government by that industry, the net return is 48 cents on the dollar. In other words, its effective tax rate is 52 per cent or 53 per cent. Of every $10 million it pays in fees, $5.2 million is deducted from income tax owing. The net gain to the Government of Canada is $4.8 million, less whatever it costs to collect it. It is going to look great in the