

that government does not understand the historical background of an issue. That is why the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre mentioned to our colleagues on the Government side and the Progressive Conservative side the historical background for the reason we feel the motion of the Hon. Member for Regina West is so extremely important for this Bill. It protects in a very clear and specific way the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board.

I have a feeling that very shortly Progressive Conservative Members will join up with the Liberals and cancel this motion out. That is why it is so important that we tell all Hon. Members what is going on and what will happen.

Yesterday I was surprised to hear my good friend and constituent, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn), who has the intelligence and the foresight to live in my constituency of Saskatoon East—

Mr. Nystrom: "Red" Ray Hnatyshyn.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Don't ask him how I vote!

Mr. Ogle: The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West made what I consider to be a very blatant attack on my colleague, the Hon. Member for Regina West. I understand the process of debate, Mr. Speaker, and I realize that if one has a good point to make, there is no reason not to make it. However, I felt that the remarks of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West had nothing to do with the speech made by the Hon. Member for Regina West. The best thing that I could say about the remarks of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West is that they were a lot of hot air.

I do not know how to reprove my friend, colleague and constituent, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West, but I feel that I shall have to speak to his mother because his mother has always—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That's taking it too far now!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Hon. Member is stretching the rule of relevancy beyond on all bounds and limits. I would invite him to return to the two motions which are before the House.

Mr. Ogle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall return to the motions before the House. However, I really feel that what I have just said is relevant and I think the Hon. Member's mother is relevant too. She must get in on this.

In any event, the question of orderly marketing is at the core of what we are discussing today. I shall go back to the historical remarks made by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre. The question of orderly marketing is essential to the whole question of grain transportation on the Prairies. If anything is done to weaken the authority of the Canadian Wheat Board with its guarantees to see that orderly marketing would proceed, then we are in for trouble on the Prairies. There is no question about that. The process of

Western Grain Transportation Act

orderly grain marketing is essential to western Canada as distinct from other wheat growing areas in the world.

For instance, India actually grows seven times as much wheat as Canada but there is not that basic problem of transportation of grain because the people of India use the grain themselves. Our economy and our lives as western Canadians depend upon the fact that the Canadian Wheat Board is able to gather, transport and sell our grain in an orderly way to the grain markets around the world. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre, pointed out, it is extremely important that this facility is preserved. Motions Nos. 39 and 40 are working in that direction.

I would call upon my colleagues in the Progressive Conservative Party and in the Government Party to support Motion No. 40 which protects in an absolute way the reality of the situation. That is what Mr. Jarvis insisted upon in the committee hearings. I would like to put on record what Mr. Jarvis asked for at the committee hearings. He said:

"It is an economic fact in the grain industry . . . transportation and sales are inextricably linked; but transportation must effectively serve sales needs. The current system with the GTA making the initial splits in cars has not become too cumbersome. But a danger exists.

● (1140)

Policy makers—and we say this to you—

He is talking now to members of the committee last summer.

—should be very careful in not separating further the vital link between transportation and sales.

Motion No. 40 would guard, finally, totally and into the future, the rights of the Canadian Wheat Board to protect that link between transportation and sales.

Mr. Gibbings happens to be a neighbour of mine from Rosetown, Saskatchewan. I have known him for many, many years. He first served as a member of the co-op board in Rosetown when I was a student working at the store. He has also been president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and has been a Wheat Board commissioner for the last 12 years or more. He also insists that the separation not take place but that the rights of the Canadian Wheat Board be protected. He has said:

It is imperative that grain sales and grain transportation not be separated. The Canadian Wheat Board must be able to arrange the transportation of its own product or it cannot fulfil its obligations to western grain producers or their customers overseas. The board's marketing success, meaning sales success, depends on its ability to make day-by-day or even hour-by-hour decisions on grain movement. Its flexibility must not be compromised.

We believe that unless it is clearly written into the Bill that that power cannot be changed, the power would be taken away, and the transportation of grain on the Prairies would be in jeopardy in the future.

I appreciate that many Progressive Conservatives are worried about this debate. That is why there are very few of them in the House and why few of them speak on it. There is a tension in the Party. I should like to ask my friends to my right—and many of them are talking to me in loud voices—