

Mrs. Mitchell: How will they know what the people of western Canada want, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Mitchell: I can see by the reaction, Mr. Speaker, that we have again hit a Tory nerve. I will leave it to one of my colleagues to continue references from Mr. Gallagher's book—

Mr. Malone: That is a good idea.

• (1810)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but her time has expired.

Mr. Friesen: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, has the Hon. Member overlooked the millionaire Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)?

Mrs. Mitchell: Yes, I guess I have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order. Is the House ready for the question? The Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young).

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I rise again to speak on a Bill which is commonly referred to as the Bill to amend the Crowsnest Pass freight rates. I will come to the Tory hecklers in a moment, Mr. Speaker. The question which is being debated today is actually a motion to close debate on this particular measure before the House. The reason given by the Hon. Member for Rosemont (Mr. Lachance) who moved the motion yesterday, which is recorded at page 26521 of *Hansard*, is quite clear. The reason he gave the House for moving such a motion was that he felt there had been sufficient debate on this particular Bill. He suggested that the Opposition, particularly the New Democratic Party, was being obstructionist in terms of dealing with this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Smith: Right.

Mr. Young: I hear my good friend, the Hon. Member for Don Valley East (Mr. Smith) saying, "right". He is quite wrong, Mr. Speaker; dead wrong. What the New Democratic Members of Parliament were simply doing was exercising their responsibility toward Canadians and their constituents. They felt they had the right to present a grievance to Parliament through petitions. It was in fact the motions placed by the Government House Leader on at least four occasions which led to delays in terms of the debate which was being conducted in this House. These were not motions which were moved by Hon. Members of either the New Democratic Party or the Conservative Party.

The Table Research Branch, under the authority of the Clerk of the House of Commons, recently circulated a procedural paper entitled, "The Previous Question", which deals quite effectively, I believe, with what the Hon. Member for Rosemont did yesterday. In discussing The Previous Question under Standing Orders, the paper had this to say:

Western Grain Transportation Act

The Previous Question is a debatable superseding motion which must be given the right of way when proposed during a debate. The wording of the Previous Question motion as set out in Standing Order 56 (1) is: "That this question be now put". Essentially, the Previous Question has two functions:

(a) it is designed to limit debate since, until it is decided, it precludes all amendment to the main question—

Therefore, for Hon. Members on the Government side to even suggest that they were not trying to close off debate is laughable, to say the least, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to deal now with, at least my perception of what the Government is trying to do. That is, in essence, to hand Canadian Pacific Railway just another boodle of money, when it talks about changing the Crowsnest Pass freight rates. Because when one takes a look at the kind of boondoggle which Governments over the years have given to CPR, it rather boggles the mind. This is a company which has been living at the public trough since 1881.

If one takes a look at the subsidies and tax writeoffs this company has received over those years, one perhaps has a better understanding of this Government's relationship with CPR. In 1982 dollars, over the years, the CPR has been given billions of dollars of taxpayers' money in subsidies. When one looks at the number of companies which operate under Canadian Pacific investments, one sees that the list grows longer and greater and is something about which anyone in this House, and certainly Canadian taxpayers, must be rather concerned. The present value of Canadian Pacific, for example, is in the area of something like \$2.9 billion. In 1981 alone, Canadian Pacific Limited owed something like \$1.65 billion in deferred income tax, and that is according to its annual report. If that is adjusted to 1982 dollars, the present value of the deferred taxes alone which it owes the Canadian Government and the Canadian taxpayer is in the area of \$1.83 billion.

Why all the haste? I came across some figures released by the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada which list the amount of political contributions, for example, given by Canadian Pacific companies to both the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party between 1978 and 1980. For example, the total 1978-80 political contribution to the Conservative Party was \$190,257. The Liberals did slightly better than the Conservatives because in 1979 the Liberal Party received something like \$198,476 from Canadian Pacific companies. In 1980 Algoma Steel gave the Conservative Party \$5,000, and to be equitable it gave the Liberal Party \$5,000 in the same year. In 1978 International Paper gave the Conservative Party \$15,000. For some reason it took umbrage at the Tories and did not give them anything in 1979 and 1980, whereas in 1978 it gave the Liberal Party \$15,123 and in 1979 they upped that to \$25,572. In 1980 it decided neither of the two Parties were worth any more money and it gave them nothing.

Mr. Smith: Shocking.

Mr. Young: It was. I totally agree with the Hon. Member. Canadian Pacific, for example, in 1980 gave the Tories \$35,000 and, again, it treated the Liberals, its buddies, to the same amount of money, \$35,000. Cominco in 1979 and 1980