received from the CTC a total abandonment. That line is now completely abandoned.

These are the kinds of ironclad guarantees I am talking about and the kind of thing the former Minister was attempting to get. Since these guarantees are not in the Bill we believe that Motion No. 50 would attempt to establish some of those guarantees in the legislation.

I indicated that in the letter to the former Minister on January 28 the railways made very few written commitments, and those few only for 1983. At the time, the Minister had been telling the House that the railways would be investing $16.5 billion in the coming decade. But the railways reserved for themselves the option of reducing that amount. They made it quite clear at the committee stage that their plans were not being presented to the committee and that they were not making any guarantees beyond 1983. In fact, they said in their letter of January 28, which was tabled:

> Variations from this expectation could lead to changes in the railways' capital plan during the period beyond 1983.

That was from Canadian Pacific. Canadian National wrote:

> —CN will inform you quarterly of capital investment progress with particular emphasis on major projects in western Canada, and a final review will be made at the end of 1983.

That statement came from the Crown corporation, the railway, over which the Minister would be expected to have some control.

There are even fewer guarantees from CP. Canadian Pacific is the railway which I submit has basically been built with the taxpayers' money and maintained to a great degree with the taxpayers' money. We get virtually nothing back from CP other than the strips of steel across the country.

What does that cost us? The total identifiable aid in 1916, when a royal commission looked into the matter in 1917, amounted to $279.5 million. That included railway and surveys completed by the Government of $37.8 million and direct cash aid of $66.9 million. The value of unsold lands is estimated at $119 million. Returns from lands sold minus the cost of improvements amount to something over $55 million.

Assuming a 5 per cent return on capital at that time, the present value in 1982 dollars of that aid would be $8.3 billion. If you add the present value of the subsidies for operating branch lines of some $2.9 billion you will see that the total current value of aid from federal sources to the CPR exceeds $11 billion and comes very close to the total current value of the CPR.

● (1840)

This company's shares have increased with the announcement of the policy change by more than 40 per cent in just five and a half months. It seems to me the market is guaging the policy proposal more accurately than some of the parliamentarians. The market has decided that the cash incentive this Parliament will give to the railways will be translated very directly into increased dividend payouts, in fact almost dollar for dollar. It is a direct transfer from the people of Canada to the shareholders of CPR.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on these motions. I am a little astounded as I follow the remarks of Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse), particularly about two things, one being aid to the CPR. When we were intensively trying to convince the NDP to support payment of the $651 million to the producers rather than the railroads we got no support at all from those Members.

Mr. Althouse: What is the difference?

Mr. Schellenberger: Surely, if there is concern about how the railroads were spending the money, then the support ought to have come for the payment to the producers so the producer had some way of ensuring his product was delivered in a proper fashion.

Mr. Althouse: You pay the producer and charge him ten times rather than five times. What is the difference?

Mr. Schellenberger: Now we see the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre has moved a motion which will, in effect, destroy the Crow.

Mr. Althouse: No.

Mr. Schellenberger: The Hon. Member's motion refers to the number of percentage points by which the freight-to-price ratio in that calendar year exceeds 3 per cent; which means the shipper should not pay any more than 3 per cent. I see the Hon. Member is getting a little agitated. I can understand why. He will have a lot of problems defending what he has just put before the House.

If you look at the statistics, Mr. Speaker, you will find now that the producer is not paying any more than 2.5 per cent. That is the Crow rate today, not 3 per cent. The Hon. Member for Humbodt-Lake Centre has just stood in the House today and moved a motion that in effect destroys the Crow. What is this Party saying? You should not destroy the Crow. The farmers can in no way spend any more of their money for moving grain. That is why we proposed the Bill be frozen for three years.

An Hon. Member: That's an act of desperation.

Mr. Schellenberger: What is the Member proposing? The NDP Members felt they had to put some motions forward that were not frivolous. They ran out and quickly tried to draft a few amendments to put them before the House for unanimous consent. They did not even know what they were doing.

An Hon. Member: They copied a Government amendment.

Mr. Schellenberger: The NDP and the Government have been together for some time. It is no wonder the NDP would copy a government amendment and put it before this House.