

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Friesen: Incoherent, but sober.

I must say that this really began last week when we were debating the amendment the New Democratic Party put forward, one which was to give the Bill a six month hoist. We supported it, and we wanted to support it. The tragedy is that the New Democrats themselves did not support it because 35 per cent of their caucus was not here to vote, including some of the prairie Members, who were absent for the vote, as well as their Leader.

The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville spent part of his speech tonight attacking the Liberals for this legislation. I would remind him, and the people on the Prairies certainly know, that it was because of the New Democrats that the Liberals are in office and have had the opportunity to bring this legislation forward. It does the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville no good to shed crocodile tears tonight for what the Liberals are doing, because all along the New Democrats have been aiding and abetting the Liberal Party.

Mr. Fulton: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to remind the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) that when this legislation was brought into the House, 37 Tories were missing and the Government only got in by 24.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member does not have a point of order.

Mr. Friesen: The Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) does not have a point of order, and there are lots of other things he does not have as well.

Mr. Smith: Explain.

Mr. Friesen: Then the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) has the audacity to come in here tonight, after botching the vote last week, and bring a motion to refer the subject matter of the Bill to committee and stall the debate some more.

Mr. Benjamin: Don't you want to?

Mr. Friesen: The Members of the NDP are talking out of both sides of their mouth. On the one hand, they said that they would do anything to block the legislation, but on the other hand they say they want to send it to committee.

Mr. Benjamin: No, no, the subject matter.

Mr. Friesen: The Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) is already giving the House instructions as to what kind of a committee we ought to have. How do they want to have it? They want to block it at all stages and do anything to prevent it from being passed, yet on the other hand they want to sit on the committee. Where are they?

Then I listened to the Hon. Member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke (Mr. Parker) speak this afternoon about the Dominion lands in his riding. I listened to him as he very clearly said that the provincial Government ought to have all powers related to energy resources. That is not in agreement

Western Grain Transportation Act

with his neighbour, the Hon. Member for Kootenay West (Mr. Kristiansen) who said that he and the former Premier, David Barrett, would turn over all their resources to the federal Government. If those neighbours cannot get along, it is understandable why 84 per cent of the people of Canada cannot get along with them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: They are only part of the 16 per cent solution in Canada.

Mr. Benjamin: Benno, get some notes from somebody so you can keep talking.

Mr. Friesen: However, there is good reason why we should oppose the legislation. First, we should oppose it because of the process under which it was introduced in the House. For a year and a half the Minister travelled across the country holding press conferences, giving bits and pieces of information to the Canadian people as to what the Crow legislation ought to be. However, he never tabled a Bill in the House. He would not give us a Bill. He would not let us study it. All the while, he was giving pieces of information, to the Liberal lobbyists across Canada, just enough, at least the desirable parts which he felt they would like to have, so that they would lobby for the Government and put on the heat here, hoping there would be a stampede of support for the Crow legislation. We heard the people from the lumber industry in B.C. saying, "Support the legislation". This was said a year and a half ago when the proposals which the Minister brought to us were completely different from the legislation that was tabled a year and a half later. Those good Liberal lobbyists from the West Coast said to support the Bill, but then the Government radically changed the legislation, and the Liberal lobbyists still say, "Support the legislation". Is it any wonder why we give scant attention to the imprimatur of that kind of lobbyist? The process has been wrong, first, giving it by news conference, but also, by withholding it from the legislators so we could not study the legislation itself. The process is wrong.

Then around May 10, the Government brought in a complicated Bill with a complicated payout formula, a complicated subsidy formula. Two days later, it wanted to debate it. Then two days later, it wanted to impose closure. If the Bill is good, then it surely deserves open debate. Surely if it is that good it can withstand scrutiny under the light. Why is it that after two days of debate the Government wanted to impose closure?

When a Bill affects a \$6 billion industry in one part of the country, when the livelihood, the lifestyle, the way of life of millions of people is affected, why should closure be imposed? Rest assured, as someone pointed out the other day, if it had been legislation with regard to the fisheries industry in the Maritimes it would not have faced closure in two days. However, it affects the farmers in western Canada. The well-versed Hon. Member said, "They don't have a subsidized industry". I wish that the Bill included a subsidy for the producers, but it is all going to the railways.