

to meet the transportation requirements of the people of Canada.

Another reason so much has been done for and given to Canadian Pacific since 1881 is that the people of Canada recognized at that time that our climate and our geography must be taken into account and that, because of the nature of our country, there cannot be competition, duplication, and private ownership in transportation. In a country such as Canada those things do not work. It is totally unfair to expect one individual or company to carry a load and suffer a loss on something which benefits the nation as a whole. I do not expect the board of directors of Canadian Pacific to donate \$100 million a year to Canada if that means a loss for them in their total operations, but I do expect them to contribute their share.

Surely transportation costs should be shared by the people of the nation as a whole. That sharing can best be done through a publicly owned transportation system which is paid for by the people of Canada, and is accountable to them. With public ownership Canadians would know that they would be provided the kind of service, the amount of equipment and the quality and capability which are needed for our grain production to continue to compete and to allow us to increase our share of the responsibility for feeding the world.

● (1552)

I want to close by saying one last thing. This situation is not peculiar to just the transportation of grain. There has been a never ending problem with our railroads from coast to coast. Newfoundland is still not part of confederation when it comes to transportation. Transportation has been a chronic problem for decades in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick because of insufficient railway equipment and low locomotive power to move their potato crop.

For decades there has been a never ending problem with transportation in all parts of Canada because of insufficient railway equipment and inefficient locomotive power to move livestock. It has been a never ending problem in southern Ontario and in British Columbia, which has been going on for years because of insufficient railway equipment and insufficient capacity to move our fruit crop.

Every year when it is time to export lumber, there has not been sufficient equipment to meet the demands. So the situation is not just peculiar to the transportation of grain. For decades both our major railroads have set a record in inadequacy. The matter has been brought up in parliament year after year, by members in all parties, and the situation has never been corrected.

This government and its predecessors have continued to cling to and clutch the concepts of the 1890s of competition and profitability in transportation. No other country in the world, other than Canada and the U.S., cling to and clutch that concept any longer. In other countries, private enterprise and governments have taken action decades ago, and have shown what can be done. It is time that this parliament acted.

### *Movement of Grain*

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House also welcome the opportunity to debate this very important issue, and I am particularly pleased to enter the debate at this time. It is certain that this debate is timely. With each passing day we find the transportation system in this country becoming progressively worse. There is no question but that it requires some serious attention very soon.

I want to join my friend, the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), in condemning the government for its failure to provide strong and firm leadership in this area. I want to condemn it as well for its failure to live up to its commitments given at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference in July of 1973, and reiterated in the election campaign of 1974. Those of us who campaigned at that time all remember that great declaration by the transport minister, echoed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), "Elect us and we will revamp the grain handling system from the granary on the farm to the ship in the harbour." It is significant to note that since that election campaign of 1974, the record will clearly show that the over-all capacity of our grain handling and transportation system has not increased and we have not come close to meeting the targets of which the minister spoke so boldly during that election campaign.

Quite frankly, what is happening is that the producers and the people of Canada simply do not believe the government any longer and do not trust it. Anything that is said by the government is taken with a grain of salt and considered as a measure of jockeying for maximum political advantage.

What is interesting to note as well is that in the throne speech which opened the last session of parliament—I presume it is the last session—no mention was made of grain handling and transportation, notwithstanding the fact that the Speech from the Throne addressed itself to two very important issues in the country, namely, national unity and the economy. I find that very strange, because surely maximizing our grain export opportunities is one way in which we can assist our balance of payments, stimulate the economy, and improve the over-all position of the western grain producers.

Having said that in dealing specifically with the motion, I have to say that I find it far too restrictive and too narrow in its over-all approach. To listen to my friend, the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre, you would have to conclude that if the minister forced the railways to add 4,000 hopper cars and repair an additional 5,000 boxcars, and gave the Canadian Wheat Board more power, all our problems would be solved.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Move an amendment.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** We have not resorted to that rather unorthodox exercise of moving amendments to motions. This has been the habit adopted by the NDP.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Careful! You tried to bring in an S.O. 26 today.