

ways, under this approach, are at liberty to make investments related to grain movement, but it will be the Canadian Transport Commission, not American-based consulting firms, that will determine their appropriateness as it relates to grain movement.

Those are just some of the comments I had to make. I am sorry that the New Democratic Party Members are using the time of the House in a frivolous manner. I am sorry that they continually stand up, Member after Member, and decry the corporate welfare bums, pointing out that they have millions of acres of land, millions of dollars in rolling stock given to them, millions of dollars in branch lines, on and on and then turn around in the next breath and say that they will not give the farmer the option of payments, that they cannot trust the farmer, that he cannot handle his now affairs.

They are saying to the same Government that they want it to pay the railroads, the same corporate bums, as the NDP would put it. Motions Nos. 52 and 53 are the same. The one before us is the Conservative motion. All we are asking for is freedom of information.

I see that you are signalling that I have one minute, Mr. Speaker. I will try to wrap up. We are signalling to the Government, which brought in and passed recent legislation on freedom of information, that the farmer has to pay the shot the way the Bill has come down now because the majority Liberal Government is forcing the farmer to pay more. There is a clear understanding and a clear commitment that this money will go to upgrade the rolling stock of the railroads and the transportation system, yet we have a clause that does not allow the information to go to the farmer as to where his money will be spent. That is a shame. It should be looked at. I hope Hon. Members will consider that.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53. Basically those motions say that when the railways reap the benefit they will reap through the legislation being debated today, that money must be put into the improvement of the transportation system in this country. That is an important and necessary motion.

Many of us who were brought up on the Prairies remember the history of the CPR. As we have heard many times over the last few months, the CPR was given acres and acres and millions and millions of dollars to build the railway system for which the Canadian taxpayers paid. In return for that, they were to maintain a proper railway system in this country, but as we all know, the Canadian taxpayers are always paying to upgrade the rail lines of this country.

What has happened with the profit of the CPR in the past and what will happen with the new profit of the CPR under this legislation is that the money will leave the railway system, and sometimes even leave the country. One need only look at the corporate structure of the CPR to realize what a great Canadian company CPR is.

I only have a few minutes to speak, so I will list only one or two of the great Canadian Pacific companies. Canadian Pacific Steamships Limited is wholly owned and incorporated in

Western Grain Transportation Act

Great Britain. Canadian Pacific Bermuda is wholly owned and incorporated in Bermuda. What happened is that Canadian Pacific is not even a good Canadian corporation.

How can they be trusted to take the money they will receive under this Bill to maintain the railway system in this country? If we do not specify this, they will go back to the history they have had since day one. They will reap the benefits but not reinvest them in Canada or in the transportation system. We say the amendment is absolutely necessary to the integrity of the transportation system in Canada. If we do not have it, we run the risk of, five years down the road, having another Bill basically the same as this Bill which will provide more money to the railways in one shape or another in order to maintain the rail lines.

It has been the history of the last 10 or 15 years that we have had to fight with both CP and CN to maintain those tracks. In my riding of Churchill, more Government money comes in than CN money to maintain those tracks. Year after year CN tries to discontinue service throughout the North. How can we trust one Crown corporation and one private enterprise corporation which have in the past so often betrayed the people they are supposed to serve? They have often neglected the communities concerned, cut out passenger rail systems, discouraged the use of freight, and cut back on the use of express service for the transportation of goods. Even when it is the only means of transportation, which happens so often in northern Manitoba where there are no roads to a community and people must rely on the rail passenger and freight traffic, the company has talked about taking out the rail system altogether, both the transportation system for passengers and the freight service.

If we are to be responsible legislators, we must provide protection for the farmers and for the consumers of our railway system under this Act. As I said earlier, we have a history in this country of having one Act after another which gives money to the railways in one form or another. That is the very purpose of the Act which we have in front of us today which is going to kill the Crow rate. Why do we continue to give them money without any real control of the future of the transportation system? One hundred and two years is a long time to keep dumping money into the CPR. It is a long time to be maintaining what is a private enterprise system. It is a long time to be paying for something that we have paid for time after time. I wish we would not pass this Bill but if we do pass it we should put an end to the charity that we have allowed to exist when it comes to dealing with the CPR and the CNR.

• (2030)

The second motion, which is supported by both the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party, is basically a freedom of information motion. It says that the profits of the CN and CP cannot be kept hidden from the public. If CN and CP provide information to the Senior Grain Transportation Committee, that information can be made public. It does not say it must be made public; it says it can be made public. If the Senior Grain Transportation Committee feels that that