

point for me personally concerning how I feel about this whole debate. First, Bill C-155 was introduced on May 10 with the totally unexpected provision of paying the full amount to the railways and nothing to the grain producers in the west. Second was time allocation or closure, whatever you want to call it, that was moved by the Government after only two days' debate on second reading. These two developments caused an explosion of opposition by western farmers to Bill C-155, especially the "pay the railways only" provision. There was widespread anger, frustration and disbelief that such legislation could develop after all the good work done by the Gilson group. It was also this development that encouraged our Conservative support for the freedom of choice option that would allow western grain producers to designate who should receive that Crow benefit. Either the producers would get it themselves or they could designate that it go to the railways if they so desire. Unless this option is provided in Bill C-155 either at committee stage or in some other way, I have to say that I cannot and will not support this legislation.

Mr. Pepin: How much support do you have from your own colleagues?

Mr. Hargrave: Dr. Clay Gilson has quite recently indicated that this option or this approach could still be incorporated in a revised final transportation policy. He made that statement just a few days ago. Gilson also stated that Quebec's fears of excessive competition in its beef cattle and hog operations from western Canada are vastly exaggerated.

I want to conclude by reading an interesting letter I received quite recently. It is dated June 6, 1983, and it comes from a mixed grain farmer and cattleman at Aden, Alberta, located on the Milk River near the Montana border. His letter reads:

Dear Sir:

What is wrong with freedom? Specifically what is wrong with freedom of choice?

If we lived in the Soviet Union or one of their satellite countries we wouldn't have a freedom of choice. Government would make our decisions and choices for us. They would tell us what crops to grow, when to deliver it, and how much we get paid for it.

Increasingly the agricultural policies of the Government of Canada seem to be designed to weaken and undermine whatever freedoms we have left. If they go ahead with the "pay the railways" scheme it will essentially become unprofitable to grow anything in western Canada except wheat for export to the Soviets.

Mr. Benjamin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) is rising on a point of order, but again I appeal to Hon. Members not to make false points of order.

Mr. Epp: Let the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave) finish, Les.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I hope you hear my point of order before you decide whether or not it is false.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I appeal to the Hon. Member to respect the rules and procedures of the House, as I am sure he will. Will he please state his point of order?

Western Grain Transportation Act

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, you will not know whether or not my point of order is false until I have said what it is. I expect the Chair to hear my point of order. I want to ask the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat whether he believes that the livestock producers of Alberta want to rob—

Mr. Epp: That is not a point of order, that is debate.

Mr. Benjamin:—their neighbours, who raise grain, \$25.00 or \$35.00 a tonne when they lose the Crow rate. If that is what he is up to, I want to tell all the grain producers in Alberta—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Surely the Hon. Member realizes that he does not have a point of order. If he chooses to intervene in the debate that option is open to him. The Hon. Member cannot make complaints about the Chair when the Hon. Member in the course of one sitting has raised a whole series of false points of order.

Mr. Benjamin: I have another point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please resume his seat? The Hon. Member has to recognize that the Chair is trying to preserve decorum and respect for the rules and procedures of the House. The Chair appeals to all Hon. Members to remember that they have an obligation to do so. The Hon. Member for Medicine Hat.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Benjamin: I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Medicine Hat has the floor.

Mr. Hargrave: Mr. Speaker, I just want to finish—

Mr. Benjamin: I have another point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Regina West please take his seat?

Mr. Benjamin: I have another point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair does its best to preside impartially. The Chair has pleaded with Hon. Members not to raise false points of order. The Hon. Member for Regina West was recognized and he was given ample opportunity to argue his point. He did not have a point of order. I ask the Hon. Member for Regina West to consider perhaps letting the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat finish his speech. The Hon. Member for Regina West can be recognized for debate at the end. Apparently the Hon. Member has something he wishes to contribute to debate—

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker:—I am sure that before these proceedings are over the opportunity will be afforded to him again. The Hon. Member for Medicine Hat.