

and I want to ask you now: Are you willing to do the same thing for us?

[*English*]

I hope that they will, Mr. Speaker, because if they do, then perhaps we can at least add a bit more protection for the prairie farmer from this horrible Bill that the Government across the way wants to force on prairie farmers through the use of closure.

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to register in the strongest possible terms my objection to the fact that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) failed to take his place in the speaking order today after having been recognized and causing a procedural wrangle on Tuesday.

**An Hon. Member:** That is not a point of order.

**An Hon. Member:** It is a point of view.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Debate.

**Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments regarding the motions that are before us today and regarding some of the implications those motions have for the Canadian Wheat Board in particular. When any Member from the other side of the House who represents a riding from the prairie Provinces gets up to speak, we have heard him speak as if we have no comments to make that may be of any positive nature. However, I think there are some implications in this Bill in general, and specifically in these motions, that do apply to Hon. Members from ridings right across the country.

When thinking about this Bill, I think particularly of my own constituency of Nanaimo-Alberni. Constituents there are not happy with the way their particular railway system is functioning and they are not happy with the kind of say that they have in the process of scheduling passenger services and services for the export of commodities. The implications of Motions Nos. 39 and 40 correspond to some of the problems that Vancouver Island residents have with the E & N Railway, a railway that is under attack by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which wants to curtail the use of that railway system on Vancouver Island for passengers. People who live on Vancouver Island have the same need of that rail system as the prairie farmers do of theirs in terms not only of passenger service but more particularly as it applies to this Bill, the transportation of grain and the improvement of that system.

On Vancouver Island we have a company that is not very interested in scheduling rail transportation to meet the needs of the community but rather in scheduling rail transportation to meet their own specific needs. The railway company ignores to a large extent the promotion of the rail system on Vancouver Island. There is no attempt made to be innovative or to attract tourism despite the potential that exists.

We feel that Bill C-155 is an attempt by the Government to take the same position toward the grain farmers in the prairie Provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba in particular. We do not like what we see. We do not like the implica-

### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

tions of Bill C-155 and I am sure that is why Motion No. 39 was moved by the Progressive Conservative Party and Motion No. 40 by this Party. I think the people on Vancouver Island relate to the demand of the Canadian Wheat Board that it have control over the direction and allocation of rail cars to move grain to port. We have the same kind of demand in that we want to have some say in how the rail system on Vancouver Island can be used to move commodities and passengers in the most efficient and cost-effective way.

● (1125)

In the testimony given before the committee a representative of the Canadian Wheat Board made some relevant points which have been enunciated very well in the debate in the House and in committee. I want to repeat the main goals of the Canadian Wheat Board within the context of Motion No. 39 and Motion No. 40. In committee the representative said:

Any further reduction in the Board's ability to co-ordinate transportation will be a very important step backward for the export sales program for western Canadian grains.

Basically, what the Canadian Wheat Board is afraid of is that the transfer of authority over grain cars to the grain transportation administration will weaken its ability to transport grain to and sell grain on the export market. I think it should be recognized that the Board has the greatest opportunity to know what the needs of the producers are for transporting grain to port and where the greatest need lies for the cars if grain exports and sales overseas are to be improved. It is important that through the Canadian Wheat Board we have the authority not only to determine the quotas of grain produced but the mechanism by which it can reach port and the overseas markets.

Our amendment would not weaken the Bill but, rather, would strengthen our ability to increase the production of grain, its movement and our export sales. It is not significantly different from Motion No. 39 moved by the Progressive Conservative Party but it would change the Bill to reflect the needs of the Canadian Wheat Board and, therefore, of grain producers. It would allow the Wheat Board to retain the power to direct grain car allocation and to meet the needs of producers interested in rail upgrading as well as increasing sales on the domestic and export markets.

This Party has indicated that it supports Motion No. 39 if it is not successful in having the Government accept Motion No. 40, which is what we hope the Government will do, knowing the opposition to the particular mechanism within the Bill itself and the opposition not only of the two Opposition Parties but of the Canadian Wheat Board, which is responsible for moving grain and has had a great deal of success in the past in moving grain and marketing that grain overseas.

This Party asks that the Government look at these amendments sincerely and also look at the lobbying of the Canadian Wheat Board for amendments to the Bill. We ask it to consider particularly the Canadian producer of grain, his attempts to improve his product and to improve sales and