

If the Hon. Member for Vegreville means business, he will have his colleagues move some subamendments in order to put some teeth in this amendment. All he wants to do is repeat what is already in the legislation. I do not know if he has any experience trying to have the present legislation enforced. If you try with this amendment, you will be no better off than you are under the legislation already in place.

I have here a couple of pages from the National Transportation Act. I invite you, Mr. Speaker, to read it. Then read through the amendment which is two pages long, written by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster. It is amazing how much of the wording is similar, identical to, or fits in with what is already in the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act.

There is nobody in this House who will complain about the objectives of the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster. We will not complain about that. His objectives are beautiful. We agree with those objectives. When are the Tory Party members going to put their actions where their mouths are? When are they going to put, in this kind of amendment, how they can compel the railways to live up to the law? No Government, Liberal or Tory, since the National Transportation Act, the Railway Act, or even the old legislation under Telegraphs, Canals and Railroads, has ever been able to enforce the law. If the Government had the political will and the popular support, and any Government has the popular support to enforce the present law, we would not need this amendment which is supported by the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Mr. Mazankowski: I wonder if the Hon. Member would permit a question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) accept a question?

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to entertain a question from my hon. friend. I assume from that that you will allow a minute and a half extra for my speaking time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will need the unanimous consent of the House to extend the Hon. Member's time.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, since the Hon. Member for Regina West finds so much fault with Motion No. 58, is he satisfied with the provision that has been incorporated in this Bill by the Government, which really states that the provision of Section 262 of the Railway Act shall apply? I take it, since he has found fault with this and found it inadequate, that he finds the provisions of 34(4) acceptable. Is that correct? Would I be correct in assuming that?

Mr. Benjamin: Is the Hon. Member talking about Motion No. 58?

Mr. Mazankowski: Clause 34.

Mr. Benjamin: In response to the Hon. Member's question, maybe he has been involved with Section 262 as well as

Western Grain Transportation Act

myself. I have certainly been involved with Section 262 before the Canadian Transport Commission on at least two, or maybe three, other issues. We lost every time. I am objecting to a repetition. He has put, in different words, what is already in the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act. Every time a group of farmers, shippers or consignees tried to get protection under the present legislation, they were defeated. Where does Motion No. 58 make any damn difference from what is already in place?

The Hon. Member for Vegreville should get a couple of his colleagues to move some subamendments to put teeth into this so that it becomes something more than, and different from, what is in the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act. Under Section 26 the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat is perfectly aware of a case that we took to the CTC about livestock cars. Even though we proved that the railways were destroying and scrapping their equipment, the CTC said that it thought the railways were making a real effort. Instead of 1,100 stock cars, we got 500.

We went to the CTC under Section 262, which the Hon. Member for Vegreville just mentioned. There were numerous submissions, letters, and phone calls. The CTC said that its interpretation of Section 262 of the Act was the same as what is in the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville. It said that the railroads were making a reasonable effort. However, the time is long overdue. We should give the railroads two choices in the provision of service to shippers, either compulsory or "they have to".

● (0345)

I know that this will appeal to the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). Let us visualize his version of a fully private enterprise, free, and open market government in this country, where all the railroads were privately owned but would not provide suitable accommodation, which is in the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville. Would the Hon. Member for Bow River make it compulsory? Would he interfere?

When will the Tory Party make up its mind? A public, common utility that everyone must use directly and indirectly is the railway. It is the same as a sewer line and water line, and at the moment our rail lines are like sewer lines. However, everyone must use them. It is not possible to reconcile a public utility under an amendment such as the one supported by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. It has not worked the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act. He is simply duplicating them without putting much teeth into it. This indicates to me that, should the Hon. Member ever become the Minister of Transport again—and I wish him well—if he is going to incorporate legislation which has nothing more to it than this amendment, then he will lose. He will lose just like five of his predecessors have lost. I remind the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) about a previous Minister of Transport who said to him and me behind the curtain in this House that someone should tell the railroads that they are not running this country.