

spread broadly through this Bill, which, I suppose, would operate in competition with the Canada Grain Act and the Canadian Wheat Board Act, in order to, as he says, allow the Canadian Wheat Board to receive rewards. From whom would they receive the rewards, Mr. Speaker?

The only source of funds for the Canadian Wheat Board are the funds that are extracted from the farmers in the process of moving grain from the farm to the final market. That is done at the highest possible price in order to extract the highest price from the market and return all of the surplus funds back to the producer. How can the Canadian Wheat Board receive a reward? From whom would it receive it? Surely only from the seller or the farmer himself, who ultimately receives it anyway. There is no real, practical need for rewards to be allocated to the Canadian Wheat Board.

**Mr. Malone:** Give them a trophy.

**Mr. Althouse:** The Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) says that we could perhaps supply the Wheat Board with a trophy. I believe that that has already been done on occasion. I have seen the trophy room of the Canadian Wheat Board. Those trophies include such things as large, regular trophies right down to a bronzed pitchfork, all of which were presented to the Wheat Board at one point or another in recognition of the good job it has done.

I see that you have motioned that my time is nearly up, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, I would like to deal with the maximum level of penalties that can be levied against the railways. We argue that the railways should be named in this Bill because the other participants are already covered under previous Acts. We would like to keep it clear as to which Act applies in which case.

There are two motions in this regard, Motions Nos. 44 and 45. Motion No. 44 has the effect of saying that the railways should not be allowed to collect 20 per cent over and above operational costs until such time as the railways have complied with the shipping requirements of the Wheat Board and the producers to get the product to market. We have added something else to that through Motion No. 46, which has the effect of saying that 100 per cent of the capital cost of rehabilitating the branch lines should be withheld each year until it has been made very clear that the work has been done on the branch lines and that the railways are continuing to deliver grain according to the shipping orders and at the rate that the railways have committed to.

Motion No. 46 is very important because we all know of many branch lines which have ultimately been abandoned. There is one such line in my riding which runs from Foam Lake to Wishart. Moneys were allocated each year to keep that line in repair. Five years after the railways had already received more than half a million dollars for keeping that line in good repair, it was reported to the CTC that the line was not fit to run a locomotive over. It was in the very same state of disrepair the line had been in five years previous when the railway had appeared before the CTC.

#### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

The pertinent question asked by farmer interveners at the CTC hearings was what the railways did with the \$500,000. The records of the railway showed that it had not spent anything like that on repairs to the line, even if the wages of the repair crew were included. The answer to that question never came out in the hearings. The CTC ultimately closed the line in spite of there being great gaps in the process.

There was nothing that could be done to force the railways to provide service in 1977 and 1978, and I submit that unless it is clearly specified that there must be higher penalties built into this Bill, there will be nothing to force compliance with the needs of the western grain transportation system if these motions are not adopted and included in the Bill. We must do this now when the Bill is before us and we do have the opportunity to adopt these motions.

**Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to apologize to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone). I am sure we will be hearing from him later. I did not realize that he would rise at this time.

I rise to speak to Motions Nos. 41 through 46, Mr. Speaker. All motions grouped here are designed to protect the interests of the producers and the interests of the taxpayers who are contributing so much through this Bill to the movement of grain in western Canada. In turn, Mr. Speaker, we believe those taxpayers should have some protection from a repetition of the past history of the railways, which have not really fulfilled many obligations on behalf of the producers in Canada and have not fulfilled commitments that have been made to the Government at certain times.

I would like to deal with Motions Nos. 41 and 42. These motions basically remove from the authority of the Grain Transportation Administrator the power to establish schemes that could be applied as a sanction against all system participants, not only the railways. The motions that follow, including Motion No. 44 which stands in my name, go on to state that, in the case of other system participants, the sanctions applied should not be pecuniary sanctions.

It is very difficult quickly to deny that sanctions are provided for at this time. We know that there are sanctions provided for by other Acts but most of those sanctions reflect upon the income of the producers, whether they be sanctions applied to the elevator companies, to individual producers in the shipment of producer cars or indeed sanctions applied to companies that are shipping grain other than the normal line elevator companies.

As the grain transportation system stands today, a line elevator company may be penalized a car if it ships the wrong product or if it underships by weight. A penalty can be applied in the allocation of cars through the block system to those elevator companies. In most areas, that in turn reflects upon the producers and the producers are denied the ability to ship grain because of the denial of that car as a penalty. I would put to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is indeed a pecuniary sanction on producers of grain.