

continually going to the railways and being sent right out of the country with no local, multiplier effect. I assume that is not over the heads of some of my friends to the left.

The Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) rose to speak. I feel that his comments and his comportment in the House reminded me of the guy who was kicked out of grade two for not shaving. That was about the level of his contribution in the House.

I want to mention that great nabob from the NDP, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), the mountains where he grows all the grain. He told us that we should stand up for farmers. As I said, I do not need anyone telling me how to stand up for farmers. I have held a permit book since I was 18 years old. I do not need guys like him to stand up and tell me what needs to be done on behalf of farmers. I happen to represent farmers and I know farmers. I speak to farmers every week when I go home. I have a fairly good idea what people are thinking at home. As I say, I do not need people from the "great plains of Hamilton Mountain" coming in to tell me how to represent farmers.

The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) is a long-time Member of the NDP, and I suspect—

An Hon. Member: He never had grease on his hands.

Mr. Mayer: Exactly; he never had grease on his hands. I do not know whether or not he has, but if he has I suspect it would have been accidental. I suspect he will be in some trouble at home when people begin to understand that he is in favour of giving all of the additional money to the railways.

Mrs. Mitchell: Don't you have anything to say on the issue?

Mr. Mayer: Sure, I have lots to say on the issue. I see that a Member from Vancouver is becoming involved. I wish more of these NDP Members from the West Coast would rise to speak.

Mrs. Mitchell: I thought you only wanted farmers.

Mr. Mayer: No, there is nothing wrong with rising to speak. I say that when the time comes to represent farmers, many of us on this side, including myself, do not need lectures on how we should represent farmers, because we understand farmers. If Hon. Members want to rise to make comments, we will be more than happy to hear them. We have heard some very excellent comments from people on this side of the House who represent areas outside of the Prairies. I would certainly welcome and encourage Hon. Members from the NDP who represent areas outside of the Prairies to rise and make some enlightened comment on this matter.

Yesterday the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville rose in the House and said: "I am afraid that the Conservative Party has sold out to big business, to the CPR". I submit that it is exactly the reverse. Given the fact that the Government is determined to modify the Crow legislation, and given the fact that it is willing to put up \$600 million a year, we are determined to give the producers a chance to have some of that money. It is the NDP that is in favour of big business, because

its Members are the ones who are in favour of giving money to the railways.

I would like to speak specifically. When I say that we are concerned about any changes being made, our concern is that there be improvements to the legislation. Let me go through some of our concerns. We want to ensure that the inflation factor, if it is applied will be an incentive to the railways to provide efficient service. I submit—I mentioned this when I had a chance to speak on the issue about six weeks ago—that the inflation factor was backwards in that if there is to be a sharing of the increase in costs as a result of inflation, the railways should be obligated to pick up the first percentage points of the inflation so that there is an incentive to railways to see that their services are run as efficiently as possible. The way the Bill is now, if the farmers are asked to pick up the first percentage points, it is almost guaranteed that there will be inflation of either three percentage points or six percentage points as far as railway costing is concerned, no matter whether there is inflation in the community at large or not. That is one of the very major concerns which we would like to see addressed.

Along the same line, we also want to ensure that if producers are to be asked to pay more, there be efficiency throughout the whole system. That means from the time the grain is loaded on to an elevator in the Prairies until the time it is put in the hold of a boat at one of the export positions in this country. That is an ongoing responsibility of the Government. It relates to everything, including labour relations and the amount of switching that goes on on the West Coast. It relates to the way our grading is established. It is a whole ongoing series of concerns which the Government must consider.

In a larger context, we must ensure that the Government understands that it has an obligation to look after some of the tariff and non-tariff barriers around the world. If we can grow things very efficiently on the Prairies, and I would submit that we can, we must ensure that Japan and the European Economic Community, for instance, do not take unfair advantage of our efficiencies here by throwing up tariff barriers and non-tariff barriers in front of our exports.

I will mention a classic example. About ten years ago, horse meat was being shipped from Montreal to France. All of a sudden, this shipment stopped. The reason was that because France decided there was a possibility of some exotic, southern hemisphere disease being transmitted from this part of the continent to France, every worker in the packing house was required to have a rectal swab once a week.

● (1220)

This is the sort of situation which the Government must address. When we do have efficiencies in production the Government must ensure that we are not left out from what happens in other parts of the world as far as exports are concerned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but his time has expired.