

the provision for a review of the regulations being promulgated under a piece of legislation which in my estimation is impossible to understand, we have a double whammy. We have limited opportunity to consider the matter. All we have is a motion which will be placed before a committee and subsequently before the House of Commons. The motion is simply that we either accept or reject the regulations. It is an either/or, black or white proposition. There is no opportunity for us to work in a constructive manner to improve those regulations which may require improvement or delete provisions we think are harmful or difficult. We either accept or reject the whole package. That is what is indicated in the provisions of the Bill; that is what we are being asked to consider in one hour on the floor of the House of Commons.

I do not think people fully understand about what we are talking. We are talking about the livelihood of people in all parts of this country; the grain producer, the cattle producer, the transportation workers, those involved in the manufacture of farm equipment and rails for our railways, those involved in manufacturing in both central and eastern Canada. We are talking about the capacity of our ports on the West Coast and at the Lakehead. All these people are concerned with respect to the operation of this legislation, yet the Government says it is going to make regulations as to how the system is going to operate, that these unknown regulations will be promulgated and Members will be given an opportunity to look at them in the committee structure.

● (1125)

When it comes to debate and discussion on the floor of the House of Commons, there are serious constraints on what can happen. First and foremost is that there will be only one hour to discuss it. How can we carry out the responsibility placed on our shoulders by the Prime Minister in the first and only Speech from the Throne that we have had in this Parliament? How can we properly articulate the concerns of our people when Members will be vying for that sacred ten-minute slot in the one hour? How many Members of Parliament will be able to tell the Prime Minister what they think about this policy?

I am somewhat more sanguine than one would think about this provision. I can stand here and rest assured, as the people of Canada will rest assured, that there is a good prospect for an upcoming election and this crowd which has foisted this undesirable, badly thought out, wrong-headed legislation upon us after that election will no longer be seated on the government side. The few remnants of them will be over on this side wondering why they did not have the courage to stand up and fight the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and the Prime Minister when they brought forward this legislation. This kind of arrogance and disregard for important parts of the country will be the downfall and demise of the Liberal Party of Canada.

In the past, the Liberal Party had fine traditions and a fine sense of national purpose. At one time it had representation in western Canada. This outfit has frittered away its mandate. It

### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

has dissipated the fortunes of that Party in almost every part of Canada, particularly western Canada. I believe if the Liberal leaders of yore could see what is happening to the Liberal Party and the way it is conducting the affairs of this country, MacKenzie King, Laurier, and other Liberal leaders would be whirling in their graves wondering what has happened to the once great Liberal Party.

**Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, we live in a country without a government. We live in a country where government is not here by mandate. It does not reflect representation of the peoples of the broad expanse of this country. Instead of a government running Canada, we have a club, a group of people.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. With respect to the Hon. Member, the debate at this point should be relevant to the amendments before us. I invite the Hon. Member to bear in mind that we are discussing Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49.

**Mr. Malone:** Mr. Speaker, no one is more thoroughly aware that we are debating Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 than I am. I am talking about Motion No. 48 which tells us that we do not have a government in this country. What we have is a club. That is what I started to say and that is what I will continue to say because it relates to Motion No. 48.

I come to this Parliament from a Province that sends 21 Members of Parliament here to face a government with only that many Members of Parliament from eight Provinces and two Territories. The rest of their Members come from two Provinces, Quebec and Ontario.

● (1130)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** With all due respect to the Hon. Member, this is a general observation and the Chair has difficulty relating it to Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49.

**Mr. Malone:** Mr. Speaker, if you do not know we are on closure, I know we are on closure. I am talking about Motion No. 48. What we are talking about here today is a Government that does not have licence. Motion 48 of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) would give us three days to debate the regulations. I am telling you, Sir, that the Government would prefer that we have one hour on a question that affects us because the Government does not have regional relevance. It is a Government that has no representation west of Winnipeg, a Government that threw away its representation.

This Government in 1968 had 48 Members in western Canada; today it has two. Motion 48 is a most justifiable motion which states that we have three days for debate on an issue that deals with transportation objectives and all sectors relating to transportation. That requires more than an hour of debate.

Those who think this club which has been formed of a few people from central Canada can take a decision on a question which is not just transportation policy are wrong. This is not just a question of who drives the train and how much the