

It is difficult to support some clauses of the Bill with which one agrees when there are other clauses that are not interrelated. I maintain that the statutory rate is something that we want maintained because it was an agreement made with the farmers to bring us into Confederation. We want that Crow rate maintained and the prairie farmers cannot afford to pay what the Liberal Government is asking of them.

The second part of this Bill to which Motion No. 33 refers is that part dealing with rail line improvements, upgrading and rehabilitation of the transportation system. We want that part split from Bill C-155. I can see that the Speaker is shaking his head, nodding in agreement or disagreement with what I am saying, but I think it simply points out the lack of empathy shown by the Liberals for the farmers of western Canada. I am very happy to be able to stand up and speak in support of this motion this afternoon.

I invite some of the Liberals to tell us how the Dominion Coal Blocks and the statutory Crow rate interrelates so closely unless it is due to their friends in Canadian Pacific who donate approximately \$50,000 a year to the Liberal bagman who comes around. Does that not really have more to do with the passage of this Bill and lumping those three areas together than actually setting down good legislation for the Canadian people and western Canadian farmers in particular? Is that not the real truth behind this Bill?

Therefore, I suggest that my remarks are relevant. I gave the example of an interchange agreement over a line that is owned by the Canadian National which goes into the Port of Churchill. That is only one example of interchange agreements which may exist between the rail companies if the Grain Transportation Agency or some other agency to replace it were given that authority if the Bill is passed.

I suggest the Liberal Government should think again when the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Flis) stands up to say that the remarks I have been making this afternoon are not relevant to Motion No. 33 before us. That motion states that there must be some obligation placed upon the rail companies to make them give guaranteed service on rail lines through interchange agreements because dual ownership over the lines and rolling stock does not exist. Instead, we see a single rail company becoming involved in petty arguments with the other rail company. It does not want to give good service, or even if it wants to do so, it does not provide the kind of service that the Canadian producers think should be given in return for all the benefits which have been given to rail companies over the years by the Canadian people and by this Parliament. The Government should be ashamed of the guaranteed annual income which has been delivered by it to the railways and also by the people who produce our grains in western Canada who, in good faith, have in some cases bought rolling stock for the rail companies without guarantees. I think that is very important and very relevant.

● (1720)

I call on Members in the New Democratic Party to support this motion to make sure we not only improve the rail trans-

### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

portation system in Canada but we also get from the rail companies some guarantee of performance for the producers of western Canada.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Since the Hon. Member has some time left, would he be willing to answer a question?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member's time has expired. A question and answer period is not provided in the rules at this point. There would have to be unanimous agreement of the House. Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the amendment, Motion No. 33, which reads:

The Grain Transportation Agency Administrator may promote, and shall require, if necessary, reciprocal and other arrangements between the railway companies to facilitate the efficient and reliable movement of grain for the purpose of maximizing returns to producers.

I want to congratulate the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) for proposing this amendment. I would urge the Government to support it. When we as Members of Parliament representing the taxpayers of Canada are looking at the possibility of forwarding \$1 billion a year for the next three years to the railway system, most definitely we must have someone in an administrative position who will protect the very producers we are talking about.

For a moment I want to comment on the remarks made by the Parliamentary Secretary and the remarks made by the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport. He suggested that the Transport Commission should be the one to deal with this. We have seen the record of the Transport Commission. We know of the backlog of work. We know, with regard to VIA Rail, what has happened there and what has happened to the recommendations. We know about the abandonment of lines. For them to suggest that they should be the governing body which would make recommendations is certainly not something with which I would feel comfortable, nor would I want to stand by when the taxpayers' money is being invested.

I would like to comment on some of the remarks made by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall when he spoke at the Transport Committee hearing in Regina on August 9, 1983. I think it is imperative that we look seriously at what he said. He said, in part:

—one of the great grain producing areas in Saskatchewan between Saskatoon and Calgary served by the Canadian National Railways; it is closer to Vancouver at Rosetown than to Thunder Bay, so the trend is westward. Grain was taken to Calgary, but the CN has no line going from Calgary to Vancouver. So they hauled it then northward 200 miles to Edmonton so they can take it south again to Vancouver. That was the CN.

He also states that CP at the same time has brought grain into Edmonton but, because there is no line west from Edmonton, CP goes 200 miles south. It is like ships in the dark, he suggested. Here we have two trains, one CN and one CP going