

*Western Grain Transportation Act*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member's time has expired. Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, by dealing with this motion introduced by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) we have finally arrived at an amendment which deals with some of the very serious concerns of the producers and shippers of grain. It is interesting to note in connection with the term "accommodation for grain traffic", that the last two speakers for the NDP, the Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) and the Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), went to great lengths to point out how frivolous this amendment is, in their opinion.

However, I would suggest that finally in this debate, at ten minutes to four, we have arrived at some substance. The Hon. Member for Regina West has been talking about what is wrong with this Bill, but it was he and his Party who did not support a grains co-ordinator when, in fact, the grains co-ordinator was trying to bring together that which was not being carried out by the railroads.

I wish to point out some clauses in the motion which are specifically important. They deal with the loading of grains, and the receiving of grains. We have producer cars on the Prairies. This means that a primary producer can order a car and load it at a siding where the railroads service the cars, deliver them and make accommodation available for the producer to do the same. I suggest that this is an area which could be improved, that is, splitting a producer car. While this is not addressed in this motion, it is certainly an area of concern and the Minister should consider this matter at some point when enhancing the position of producers loading cars on a siding. This is quite permissible and happens quite often in various areas where the producers do not load through the elevator or a grain company but choose to order cars on their own.

This Bill deals with this situation, but the NDP consider this frivolous, instead of being concerned with the situation that faces the producers. Of course this is due to the fact that many NDP Members are not permit holders or farmers and do not really understand the intricate workings of the grain system and the problems faced by the producers, the shippers, and those who load cars. In this case I am talking about cars that are spotted as producer cars.

Another area which I do not believe has been dealt with concerns Clause 34(4) which states:

Such grain shall be taken, carried to and from, and delivered at the places aforesaid on the due payment of the toll lawfully imposed by this Act.

Under our freeze provision, this would mean that the statutory Crow rate would remain in place at least until 1986. Of course the Hon. Member for Regina West did not deal with that specifically, but circumvented our freeze position. That, of course, is most important to the farmers and producers because it would guarantee a freight rate until some sanity

could prevail on the Government side. I make that comment to the Government with respect to the ability of the producer to pay. I began to speak about this issue earlier this evening, that this ability would be upheld by this Clause 34(4) and our freeze provision. I think it is most important to consider the ability of the producer to pay.

I already indicated this evening that the House should understand the position of the Progressive Conservative Party in regard to this Bill. We are in favour of the development and the work proceeding. We do not like to hear the Government saying that we want to stop jobs or stop development. That is not true. Our contention is simply over the ability to pay. We are saying that the Government of Canada should accept the responsibility of paying the railroads for the enhancement and for the upgrading that the producers do not have the ability to pay for at this time of falling world prices and an increase in freight rates.

The Canadian producers are facing a very difficult situation when one considers the competition they meet as a result of subsidies that are paid in other countries around the world. These countries include the United States, the European Common Market countries, and Argentina, where the freight is completely paid for, and Australia where the grain growing areas are close to open waters. These situations are taken into account in Clause 34(4). Of course our provisions would also include the freeze which would open the door for the primary producer to achieve what I believe is possible for Canada.

**Mr. Benjamin:** That is my speech.

**Mr. Gustafson:** The Hon. Member for Regina West says that that is his speech. A new Canada could emerge.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask the advice of the Chair. Is there any way that another Member of the House of Commons can sue a colleague for plagiarism? He is making my speech over again.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member is not making a point of order. I call to the attention of the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson) that his time has expired. Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few short comments on Motion No. 58. I am sure you would sympathize with me when I say that it is certainly one of the longest motions we have seen in this debate during the last few weeks, because you had to read it earlier this morning.

I would certainly support the motion. I would assume that most Members on the Opposition side would do so. I predict that all Members on the Opposition side would support the motion. The Government could also support it. My research on this motion tells me that almost everything that is said in here comes under either the Railway Act or the National Transport-