

ment insurance gets a few extra dollars or if someone owes a few extra dollars in taxes, they are liable to be taken to court and fined by the federal Government. It is not fair and it is not just, Mr. Speaker. It is an economic system that must be changed and it will only be changed if people, through Parliament, say to the CPR that the people of Canada are the boss and they want a transportation system that is run on their behalf. If they are going to give money to the CPR they should take equity in the railway. We do not have the liberty of throwing away the taxpayers' money on the CPR or any other large corporation in the country. For these reasons I appeal to all Members of the House to pass Motion No. 50. If we do not, the CPR will ask for more of the same.

I have some very interesting statistics here from the annual reports of the CN and the CPR showing how much they have invested in railways in Canada in 1981. The CPR invested \$511 million and CPR \$317 million for a total of \$828 million. Adjusted to 1983 dollars that comes to \$1.33 billion.

The plan of the former Minister is called the "Pepin plan" in the west. It calls for less money to be spent now than was spent in 1981. For the CNR it is \$491 million and for CPR \$315 million for a total of \$806 million. That is a decrease of 22 per cent for the CNR and a decrease of 20.5 per cent for CP. That is another reason for Motion No. 50. It would make sure that in the years ahead the railways would invest at least as much as they invested last year on improving the rail lines.

For these reasons I suggest that Motion No. 50 be adopted. It would make sure that farmers in all constituencies would receive a better rail service. I could name rail lines in the Melville area, in the Yorkton area, and in the Kamsack area and tell horror story after horror story about them.

I see that my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I could go on and on giving concrete examples that would persuade you, as a big city Member of Parliament, of the necessity of passing Motion No. 50. It would assure my constituents of some value for the handouts they have given to that welfare bum year after year. It has taken more out of the pockets of my constituents than any other corporation or institution in the country. I am not going to stand for it, Mr. Speaker, and if you will give me extra time I am prepared to put on the record some examples of where that kind of money could be used in my constituency.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Does the Hon. Member seek unanimous consent to continue, as he knows, his time has expired?

Mr. Nystrom: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) to continue?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Western Grain Transportation Act

Some Hon. Members: No.

● (1810)

[Translation]

Mrs. Éva Côté (Rimouski-Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me an opportunity to say a few words about Bill C-155, especially at this stage where we are discussing, more specifically, Motion No. 50, presented by the representative of the New Democratic Party. A careful scrutiny of Bill C-155 shows that in Clause 29, provision has been made for obliging railway companies to submit to the Canadian Transport Commission, to the Administrator and to the Senior Grain Commission, to the Administrator and to the Senior Grain Transportation Committee, investment plans and programs by which users, that is, grain producers, will be assured of a sufficient number of railway cars and adequate railway facilities as such.

Sub-clause 2 of Clause 29 sets the criteria for monitoring programs and investments.

Mr. Speaker, sub-clause (2) was added to the initial Bill, following extremely useful and interesting discussions among Government Members, the Official Opposition and New Democratic Party Members.

I feel that all important points have been covered and that the railway companies are being asked to make a very serious commitment, looking only at the obligation to submit their investment plan for the current calendar year, to state subsequently what their results have been, while the Commission or Committee is to annually verify the investments requested, analyze the general investment plans and especially the expenditures incurred by these investments.

Therefore, I feel that adopting Motion No. 50 as proposed would be useless and redundant, since it adds absolutely nothing to the Bill itself, on the contrary, and I think that the real purpose of Motion No. 50 is to make the Members of the New Democratic Party feel they have achieved something. They blithely object to the fact that the Government of Canada, by helping the railway companies provide an adequate and necessary service in that part of our country is giving the railway companies a free ride. That is certainly not true if we consider the geography of our country, the enormous distances that must be travelled and the considerable cost to the railway companies if they are to provide the service required by their users, and, as we all know, since Section 262 of the Canadian Railway Act applies here, railway companies are obliged to provide that service.

As for confidentiality, this is referred to in Motions Nos. 52 and 53. I think it is a bit too much to demand that Members of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee not be subject to the same rules of confidentiality as the Canadian Transport Commission. And especially, if we consider the quality or the importance of the members of the Senior Grain Transporta-