

Clause 21 outlines the method in which the Administrator can engage in establishing performance objectives and regulations for the various system participants. The Hon. Member for Regina West simply wants the Administrator, by virtue of his amendment, to establish objectives only for the railroads. We have contended all along that the grain handling and transportation system constitutes a much larger body than simply the railroads. It involves the elevators, the Canadian Wheat Board, the Canadian Grain Commission, the terminals, the lakers, the St. Lawrence Seaway, the port operations and some 25 to 30 unions. Each and every one of these groups plays a very significant and unique role. Each and every one of these groups has a certain responsibility to fulfil.

I appreciate what the Hon. Member is attempting to do. He is attempting to attack the railroads. They are responsible to a large extent for whether or not grain moves, but to single them out in this case is totally wrong.

Turning to the original terms of reference or objectives of the Grain Transportation Co-ordinator, they read:

(1) to increase the grain handling and transportation system's capacity to achieve a 20 per cent increase in exports in 1980 and a 50 per cent increase by 1985 (to 30 million tonnes);

Those objectives have in fact been achieved. They would not have been achieved by simply applying performance objectives to the railroads. They brought all parties together and said: "These are the objectives and these are achievable targets; let us put our shoulders to the wheel and do just that". They continue:

(2) to ensure that prairie grain moves to domestic consumption and export positions in a prompt, efficient and orderly manner;

That was not an objective of the railroads; it was an objective of the total community. Further they read:

(3) to secure the co-operation and participation of the industries concerned in providing the required transportation and handling services and facilities;

(4) to carry out the required planning and implement the changes necessary to make the forwarding system operate more efficiently and effectively, and to increase its capacity to meet the 1985 target of a 50 per cent increase in exports;

Certainly the railroads played a very significant role. They had to have sufficient rolling stock and their house in order to move that quantity of grain. To single them out as the only component which had to meet that objective is very wrong. The last objective reads:

(5) to keep all parties and the public fully informed about the system's operations and shortcomings.

This would mean that everyone knew what was going on. The producers and the community at large knew and understood the role of each significant component and their objectives. We as a Party cannot support the NDP proposal, which excludes the other players in this very important area.

Motion No. 42 really sets out to do the same thing. In part it reads:

—implement a scheme that provides for sanctions to be applied to railway companies—

Here again the Hon. Member has sought to substitute "system participants" for "railway companies". Again it suggests to the House that it is only the railways which make a

Western Grain Transportation Act

difference in terms of whether or not grain moves. We will not be supporting Motion No. 42.

The intention of the Hon. Member in Motion No. 43 is honourable, except he may want to reconsider Clause 21(b). Clause 21(b)(i) reads in part:

—awards to be applied to system participants or any classes thereof, other than the railway companies—

The Hon. Member is proposing to substitute that with the following:

"participants, other than the Canadian Wheat Board, or any classes thereof that".

He is putting in a provision that would exclude the Canadian Wheat Board from receiving awards. If the Canadian Wheat Board performs satisfactorily and achieves its objectives, it should be entitled to rewards. Those advantages would in fact accrue to producers. The Hon. Member wanted to ensure that sanctions would not be imposed against the Canadian Wheat Board. We can support that, because we find it very wrong and offensive that sanctions would be applied to the Canadian Wheat Board which would then be transferred to producers. In effect, they would penalize producers for something over which they really have no control. If the Canadian Wheat Board, acting on behalf of producers, does its job, performs well and meets its objectives so that some benefit accrues to the Canadian Wheat Board and thereby to producers, we think it should be supported.

Other Members of the New Democratic Party may want to comment on this, but as it now stands we would have difficulty supporting it. We covered that same provision in Motion No. 44 which was introduced by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight). In part it reads:

—sanctions to be applied to system participants or any classes thereof, other than the railways, that do not meet the performance objectives referred to in paragraph (a), shall be non-pecuniary.

● (1220)

That means that any sanctions applied to the Canadian Wheat Board would be of a non-pecuniary nature and the producer would not be penalized. The Member may want to reconsider that.

Amendment No. 44 ensures that sanctions relating to performance objectives would be applied to system participants other than the railways in a non-pecuniary fashion. We think that is realistic and logical. I urge that Members of the NDP support that provision rather than Motion No. 43, which really achieves the same thing. It does not restrict the Canadian Wheat Board from receiving awards for performance and the meeting of targets that may in fact be realized, all for the benefit of the producers.

I turn now to Motions Nos. 45 and 46 which have to do with the imposition of sanctions against the railroads. They relate to the maximum level of sanctions that could be applied against the railway companies under the performance awards and sanction scheme implemented under Section 21. In the original Bill this level was set at 40 per cent of the contribution to constant cost.