

generous in terms of the funds which will be provided for the movement of grain, and very harsh in terms of the additional freight rate increases which will be imposed upon farmers.

Therefore, it is very important that Subparagraph (8) be looked at very carefully. It goes a long way toward spelling out clearly the following:

The railway companies shall afford to the carriage of grain a level of accommodation equal to that afforded to the carriage of other traffic and failure to provide such a level shall be remedied by such orders as the Commission deems appropriate in the circumstances.

The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway called that fluff. One of the reasons that is important is because we know that the apportionment of contribution to constant costs in this particular Bill is calculated at a figure of 20 per cent.

I have a document in my hand which I am sure all Hon. Members received from CN. It outlines some of the pros and cons of this particular piece of legislation. It made the point that the contribution to constant costs is not sufficient and that, in its presentation to Snavelly, it made a case for a contribution to constant costs of 35.3 per cent of volume and line related variable costs. Also the document dealt with the cost of money.

We know that that particular figure was calculated at 20 per cent for the last crop year and that it is 18.5 per cent for this year. That component is taken into consideration in determining the cost of moving grain. They left that at 18 per cent, whereas CN and CP are arguing for 30 per cent. Snavelly set it at 25.43 per cent. I urge Hon. Members to look very seriously at subclauses (7), (8), (9) and (10) because they go a long way towards strengthening the kind of legal obligation which should be imposed upon railways to discharge their responsibilities in the interests of moving grain efficiently, reliably, effectively, and in the interests of producers.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to allow the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) to continue his remarks. This is a major motion on the Order Paper. I am sure the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) would be willing to allow the Hon. Member to continue his remarks. I would suggest that the Chair should seek unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) wish to have the consent of the House to continue his remarks?

Mr. Mazankowski: I would be very happy to continue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have the unanimous consent of the House to continue?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, this provides me with an opportunity to elaborate further on the subclauses to which I referred earlier. I have already dealt with subclause (8). Now I would like to deal with subclause (9)(a) which significantly

Western Grain Transportation Act

points out the incorporation of the Administrator in terms of holding the railways accountable and providing a legal obligation for them to discharge their responsibilities and to provide adequate accommodation for traffic.

Subclause (9)(a) reads:

Where the Administrator is of the opinion that reciprocal and other arrangements between railway companies are required to facilitate the efficient, adequate and reliable movement of grain on behalf of, and in the interests of grain producers, the Administrator shall apply to the Commission for such order or orders as may be required to achieve the necessary reciprocal and other arrangements—

Earlier we had some discussion on a motion wherein we moved an amendment to obligate the railways to enter into reciprocal arrangements, if necessary, and in the best interests of producers. Here we have a repeat of that same provision, and here again the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway calls it fluff. I am startled and flabbergasted that he would make such inappropriate comments on a motion which was advanced in a comprehensive manner by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster. This particular motion goes to the very heart of performance objectives and the assurance that the necessary service will be provided.

Throughout the course of committee hearings and, indeed, throughout the debate on this Bill in the House of Commons, we heard from producer groups and organizations, particularly as we travelled throughout the country, and in the letters we received, that there were not adequate service and performance guarantees. While there are provisions contained in the Bill in terms of awards, sanctions, and what not, in terms of the individual shipper who is being aggrieved or is not provided with a service which he deems appropriate, enabling devices which would allow him to seek redress were certainly not provided in this piece of legislation. This particular amendment goes a long way toward answering that particular problem.

Turning to subclause 10(a), it gets into the real meat of the particular motion. It provides a means by which a senior Government officer may, on behalf of a grain shipper or shippers, lead the way toward the recovery of some sort of remedy for a shipper or group of shippers. When we look at the cost of litigation, I think this is a very important component for producers. I am sure the Hon. Member for Regina West could tell us about the costs of litigation. It is extremely expensive, and it is a very difficult burden to bear for small operators.

Mr. Benjamin: Oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: If the Hon. Member for Regina West wants to speak, I will yield the floor to him. I wish he would stop his mumbling, bumbling, bickering and snickering. These guys are just like a bunch of chickens. They yap, yap, and yap. There is a bunch of chickens at one end of the Party and there is a bunch of fox terriers at the other. It is the most rude group I have ever seen in a debating forum.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was simply supporting the Hon. Member for Vegreville. I was