Western Grain Transportation Act

commitments that we know they have not lived up to in the past. They have abandoned branch lines and prairie towns. They have abandoned passenger services from city to city and into some of the vital areas which depend on tourism. I would suggest that unless we include "and shall require", if we do not require the railroads to do it, they are damn well not going to do it and will only pay lip service to it.

I would urge all Hon. Members of the House to consider those three words very seriously and allow the amendment to pass because it is crucial to the legislation. It is crucial, involving as it does control by the Canadian people, who are giving this money to the railroads, to increase the service and to move commodities for the farmer. It is our responsibility to ensure that the \$1 billion a year is spent in exactly the way the railroads say it will be spent. We must require them to do it because their record sure as hell does not show that they will do it on good faith.

• (1710)

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a few words on the record this afternoon concerning Motion No. 33 amending Clause 17 in Bill C-155. As mentioned by the previous speaker, it requires the railways, CN and CP, to have interchange agreements that can actually be guaranteed or put into force.

When the Government first introduced Bill C-155, it was actually giving the railways a guaranteed annual income without any guarantee to the producers that they would have any better movement of their grain from their farms to the elevators, over the rail lines to the ports and on to the market. That is a very dismal situation and it reflects the attitude of the Government toward our producers in Canada. They are already in a very precarious position because of the economic conditions they have experienced and are experiencing. Farmers face enough difficulty when they do not get adequate prices for their products in order to cover their costs and have some margin of profit for themselves. They do not need the added burden of not having their products adequately transported to the ports.

One area where I think the interchange agreement would work very well concerns the area I represent where producers move some of their grain through the Port of Churchill. The only access to the Port of Churchill is a CN line which goes to the terminals there. Canadian Pacific does not have a line going into the Port of Churchill. Quite often, the situation arises when CN Rail may not have the cars or facilities to move grain into the Port of Churchill whereas Canadian Pacific may very well have some cars within the area that are available to haul grain to Churchill. However, they are not available because the Grain Transportation Agency or the Canadian Wheat Board does not have the power to require CN actually to use Canadian Pacific equipment to go over CN lines and haul grain from plugged elevators to a terminal at the Port of Churchill that is waiting for grain. That is one particular instance.

After all the years when land, rolling stock and money has been put into the rail lines, they are not required to have an interchange agreement for these facilities. The only one who really suffers from this are the Canadian farmers who are unable to get their grain to the ports and must put up with the frustration of having a final crop quota for which there is no room in the elevator to which the farmers traditionally haul their grain. In some cases they must haul their grain greater distances to where there might be elevator space that is on a main line or that is better served.

One point which has been stressed in the interventions that have been made this afternoon is that there is need for support from the Conservatives and, hopefully, some Liberals in the House to back up the NDP proposal to have Bill C-155 split into three very distinct parts. Those parts are: one dealing with the statutory Crow rate itself; a second dealing with the upgrading, improvement and rehabilitation of rail lines in Canada; and the third dealing with Dominion Coal Blocks.

As the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) pointed out this afternoon, this is not really a Bill dealing with grain transportation but one dealing with much more than that. We heard some Members state that they support Motion No. 33 because of the lack of guarantees from the railroads for the improvement of transportation of grain to Canadian ports.

Of course, I believe the Dominion Coal Blocks have very little to do with transportation at all, especially grain transportation. Without guarantees being provided in the Bill to have better performance from the rail companies in hauling grain, we will only further enhance the guaranteed annual incomes which the rail companies have had for so many years. At this time they are asking for a guaranteed return of 20 per cent on their investment. I would point out that this investment does not even come from the railways but from the people of Canada in terms of land grants, rolling stock and actual money given to the rail companies.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been listening very carefully to the Hon. Member. I thought we were on Motion No. 33 which states:

-promote, and shall require, if necessary, reciprocal and other arrangements-

And "the duties and responsibilities of the Administrator." I fail to see what splitting the Bill into three and the coal fields have to do with Motion No. 33 which we should be debating right now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The point of order by the Parliamentary Secretary is very well taken. Will the Hon. Member please take note of the remarks.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I have taken note and I think it just shows the unwillingness or lack of understanding that the Liberal Government has about how Bill C-155 affects the farmers of western Canada. I am trying to make the point, which I thought I was making very well, that we need some guarantees in this Bill. I support Motion No. 33 and I am pleased it was brought forward.