

telling the CPR how to spend the money it earns, although the Government has a responsibility to make sure that it earned the money before it is paid.

I do not understand how we can have two amendments that are word for word the same, one proposed by this Party and the other by the NDP. Surely one amendment should have stood the test without another being put. I do not know how that happened and I know it did not happen in provincial politics.

An Hon. Member: You didn't have the NDP.

Mr. Taylor: We had one or two Members, but not very many. The motion comes down to a definite principle—whether accountability is going to be secret or public, whether things are going to be done under the table or above the table. The amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) provides that it be done above the table, not under it. We want to know what is going on. The principles involved in these two clauses illustrate what the Progressive Conservative Party is trying to do in this Bill. The first is that you pay only when money is earned; the second is that you hold the receiver responsible; and the third is that you keep everything above board.

Can anyone tell me that the Government will not support those three principles? We are in a more serious position than I thought if the Government is going to oppose those three principles which are the heart of the Progressive Conservative action.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I want to support the arguments put forth by my colleagues in connection with these motions and to deal with some of the arguments from the Members of the Conservative Party. The Hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Cooper) suggested that if we oppose freedom of choice, the farmer should have the choice of taking the money—

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member for Peace River has not spoken tonight but I have. If the Hon. Member is referring to me, I would prefer that he use my constituency.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) said that we oppose the so-called freedom of choice because we were getting orders from union bosses. I want to tell him that I probably have as many railway workers and railway union locals in my constituency as any Member, and I have not had a single request, let alone an order, about what I should do. While I have lots of union members, I have very few farmers in my constituency and he has many. It was the prairie pools, which represent more than 50 per cent of all grain producers of western Canada, that opposed freedom of choice. If the Conservative Party wants to put forward freedom of choice, it is entitled to, but its Members should not argue that people who disagree with them, and not just Members of the NDP, are somehow being unpatriotic.

Western Grain Transportation Act

If I had known that the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) would speak tonight I would have brought in a copy of *Hansard* for the day some months ago when he made a speech about CPR in which he was as critical of it as any Member of this Party has been. I could have read that speech into the record word for word and taken the credit for it myself. Yet today, in a roundabout way, he seems to be defending the CPR.

The Hon. Member suggests that the Conservative Party stands for free enterprise, that it must not be controlled, directed or dictated to and that this Party stands for state ownership of everything. I find it interesting that in Alberta for years the Conservative Government and the Social Credit Government, in which the Hon. Member was a member of Cabinet, either on its own or in partnership with the private sector, has been involved in business much more than the NDP Government of Saskatchewan has ever been.

That proves that when you get into the real world, this concept about the great free enterprise system which must not be directed or controlled but must be allowed to operate freely, just does not work. I do not have time to put on record all the corporations in which the Government of Alberta is involved, but one good example is Pacific Western Airlines which, as far as I know, is still 100 per cent owned and operated by Government. That is something which none of the New Democratic Party Governments which we have had in recent years in British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, have attempted to do. We had a very good example of how Governments get involved in the last month or so in Atlantic Canada where the privately operated fishing industry was in fact bankrupt. The only thing which had not happened was that the banks had so much out in loans they could not afford to call in their loans, the way they do with the small businessmen and farmers. So what happened, Mr. Speaker? The Liberal Government got together with the provincial Governments of Atlantic Canada, the Conservative Government of Newfoundland, the Conservative Government of Nova Scotia, and they worked out a deal whereby the Liberal Government and the provincial Conservative Governments got together with the private sector to refinance and reorganize the industry.

● (2050)

I point that out, Mr. Speaker, simply because it proves again, as we have learned so many times in the history of Canada, that if the people of Canada are to be served, if their needs are to be met, it can often be done only by the Government or only by the Government in partnership with private interests.

That is the real lesson, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this country. Motion No. 50 says that the public's money, that is, the money which comes from the taxpayers of Canada, should be put up only to increase rail capacity and to enhance the transportation system for grain, and that money should not be paid to the railroads to enhance their profit position. We are not talking about some small corner grocer. We are talking about the largest corporation in this country, whether it is