

Mr. Deans: You cannot think of any.

Mr. Neil: I can certainly think of many comments.

Mr. Deans: Why don't you think? Why don't you make them?

Mr. Neil: I am going to talk about the amendments we are debating right now.

Mr. Deans: Come on, big mouth, make them.

Mr. Neil: A few moments ago the Hon. Member was saying that I was out of order in my comments—

Mr. Deans: I am saying you are irrelevant.

Mr. Neil: Now he is inviting me to make comments that would not be in order. I would not waste my time arguing with the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans).

Mr. Deans: Come on, show us how much you know, Moose Jaw. That is an interesting name for a guy like you.

Mr. Neil: I would like to make my comments with respect to the motions we are debating at the present time.

Mr. Anguish: Do you know what they are?

Mr. Neil: Certainly I know what they are.

Mr. Deans: Tell us about them.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: They partly reflect the NDP flip-flop.

Mr. Neil: It is an indication of the fact that the NDP are very nervous when they will not allow a Member to continue to debate.

Mr. Deans: Tell us about them.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is relevant and I will be very brief. Earlier, the Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) referred to the Member for "The Battlefords-Kindersley". Since there is no such riding I am not sure to whom the Hon. Member is referring. I want him to know that there is no longer any such constituency in the Parliament of Canada represented in the House.

Mr. Neil: If I said The Battlefords-Kindersley, it was an error. I meant The Battlefords-Meadow Lake.

With respect to the motions that are before us, particularly Motion No. 50 put forward by the Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), I would suggest that our Party was successful in committee in amending Clause 29(2) which basically does much of what the proposed amendment of the Hon. Member does. This amendment to Clause 29(2) in committee, which was approved by all Parties, strengthened the CTC position to monitor and verify the investments to be made by the railway. Consequently, we do not believe we can support Motion No. 50.

Western Grain Transportation Act

Motion No. 52 and Motion No. 53 are identical. They delete Clause 29(5) which requires the Members of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee to treat any information submitted under the clause by the railways as confidential.

The taxpayers of Canada will be contributing well over \$600 million annually to the railways. In addition, the producers of grain will be called upon to pay double and up to five times the present rate. Under these circumstances I believe it is important that the investment plans of the railways should be made public. They should not be held in confidence because the taxpayers are providing a substantial amount of money and the producers are paying a substantial amount of money. I suggest that to treat the information with respect to the investment by the railways as confidential removes the possibility of the public and the taxpayer of being critical or capable of analyzing what are the investments of the railways. It seems to me with respect to Motions Nos. 52 and 53 that these are amendments in the interest of the taxpayers. They are in the interest of the producer and they are certainly amendments which should be supported by all Members in the House.

● (2000)

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53. I would like to deal first with Motion No. 50 and try to encourage some Members on the Government side and some Members on the Tory side to respond in some relevant way to this motion. It is really not that difficult for them to deal with. It is a requirement to put some backbone into Clause 29. Motion No. 50 simply states that the money raised through the changes proposed in Bill C-155 must go back in terms of reinvestment into either main-lines, port development, branch lines, grain facilities or something related to the transportation, storage and movement of grain.

I would like to start with a few facts to which I would like to hear Government and Tory Members respond in terms of figures obtained in recent years from public accounts. First I will speak with respect to what has been given to the CPR for the movement of grain and what has happened over the years.

Let me start with 1958. According to public accounts it was given, in present 1982 dollar values, \$15.9 million. Ten years later, in 1968, this amount had jumped to \$107.9 million, by 1978 to \$190.3 million, and in 1981 it had jumped to \$253.7 million. Indexed, the total present value of public aid in dollars has been \$13.5 billion. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) pointed out, CP was given 44 million acres of land which has been used for oil and gas development, for various real estate and other development proposals. What we do know is that the total equity ownership by the public in CP Limited is zero, absolutely zero.

One of the themes that we have been trying to pursue, and I know there is a great deal of support in the country for it, is that when you are involved in giving money, whether it is to a Crown Corporation or to the private sector, you get some kind of equity back. I know that is not supported by the Tories or