

I left with the House in response to a question last Friday as is reported at page 463 of *Hansard*. The question was asked by the Hon. Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse). It had to do with the establishment of initial grain prices. I said in my response:

The Canadian Wheat Board sets the initial prices and, if he has any argument with that, he should take it up with the Canadian Wheat Board because those prices reflect the reality of the market-place—

In a practical sense, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board does establish the price by recommending to the Government that such prices be established. In a truly technical and legal sense it is the Government of Canada that sets the prices on the recommendation of the Canadian Wheat Board because the Canadian Wheat Board is the marketing agency and does have the facility of monitoring markets and is in a better position than the Government of the day to determine what the actual prices should be. If I did leave the wrong impression, I apologize to the Hon. Member and to the House.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Hon. Minister for making the correction that he made and for keeping the record straight. This augurs well for this session of the House.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I do want to make it clear that this situation can occur every day to any of us in the House. It has been our practice to avoid correcting *Hansard* in this way because it would lead to a very prolonged debate, and it is debate.

I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, if we could continue with the practice of correcting *Hansard* as we did in prior times rather than reverting to these statements and debating points that one can make following the speech that one has made in the House, or that a Minister has made for that matter. If the next day we are going to debate whether the Minister was right or wrong or whether I was right or wrong in saying something, we could go on for several hours debating such questions. If it is a question of fact that a Minister did not record properly, I would agree, but this was not fact. This was debate. It is a grey area and it is sometimes difficult for one to make clear in debate exactly what one means. I would shy away from this practice of encouraging people to make corrections to *Hansard* the next day in respect of statements they feel may have been misunderstood.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the Hon. Member is saying. I think it has been the usual practice that if there is an error in a statement or a word or a number there is a procedure for that. After reading *Hansard* this morning I felt that I may have left the wrong impression and I wanted to correct that. This would certainly be in the interests of all Members in the House. I regret having had to do it and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I do not like having to do it very often. This is different than simply an error in the recording. I think there is a differentiation.

Railway Act

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

RAILWAY ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. George Hees, for the Minister of Communications, moved that Bill C-4, an Act to amend the Railway Act, be now read the second time and referred to a Legislative Committee.

Mrs. Claudy Maily (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, today I have the honour of introducing the second reading stage of Bill C-4, an Act to amend the Railway Act. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, arises from the November 1984 economic statement by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and more especially from his May 1985 Budget. Its purpose is to recover the administration costs incurred by the CRTC in regulating the telecommunications carrier industry. Costs will be recovered from the carriers themselves, not the taxpayers, as was the case until now.

Mr. Speaker, why recover administration costs and especially, why does the CRTC regulate this industry, which is why we are asking this House to authorize recovery of these costs? Since our Government was elected, Mr. Speaker, we have emphasized economic recovery. During the election campaign, we told Canadians that the ills besetting our economy were inflation, high interest rates—those brutally high interest rates that were putting families out of house and home, making breadwinners jobless and causing small entrepreneurs to lose their businesses—and the scourge of unemployment affecting our families and especially young people. We said at the time that a remedy would have to be found and that we would start by cleaning up our public finances. This Bill is part of that process. To put our public finances on a sound footing, we must control our expenditures and then reduce them.

Reducing the deficit is a Sisyphean undertaking, as you know, Mr. Speaker. As soon as the Minister of Finance manages to cut spending so we can get our economy rolling in the right direction again, we must make every effort to get our economy to the point where we will finally be able to reduce this deficit. My point is that any effort, no matter how small, is of tremendous importance in this fight against the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, we also wanted to create a climate that was favourable to economic growth and prosperity in Canada.

As part of this process, we must put our tax system in order, contain our enormous cumulative public debt and eventually reduce that debt. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to allow the Government to recover the cost of regulating the telecommunications industry, and it is therefore part of this Government's general efforts to recover government administration costs.