

Western Grain Transportation Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. MacLaren): I anticipated the answer by hearing several Hon. Members say, no. However, I will gladly put the question. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. MacLaren): The Hon. Member for Peterborough.

Mr. Domm: I cannot let the remarks of the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) go by, Mr. Speaker, when he criticized the actions taken by the Conservative Government in bringing about what he called "detrimental results in the West", without saying that, contrary to what the Hon. Member might think or believe, it was the New Democratic Party which allowed the Liberal Party to come back into office through its motion of non-confidence. It was the Liberal Party—

Mr. Benjamin: The voters did.

Mr. Domm: No, it was an NDP motion. It was as a result of that—

Mr. Benjamin: How come you are blaming all those voters?

Mr. Domm: I know that it bothers those Hon. Members, Mr. Speaker, when they are criticized as being, it has been said, "the little red rump" of the Liberal Party. However, we would not have had a 20 per cent cut in Via Rail service across Canada if the NDP, in conjunction with the Liberals, had not brought down the Conservative Government in 1979. That is what we received in return for the Party's efforts.

It should also be noted that it was, Mr. Speaker, the NDP Members who remained perfectly silent, almost mute, on some of the issues which have most gravely affected the West. I did not hear the New Democratic Party supporting the Conservative Party when it saw the destruction which was brought about by the National Energy Program as it pursued the nationalization of one of the richest non-renewable resources in the West. It was the Conservative Party which protected the free enterprise system. And it was the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, in concert with the Government, which brought about the abolition of property rights in our Constitution. It was true that debate over the Constitution—

● (1940)

Mr. Young: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the Hon. Member would not want to mislead the House. Property rights have never been in the Constitution. Property rights have been protected by provincial Governments for many, many years and they have never been included in any federal jurisdiction. For the Member to imply otherwise is really quite unforgivable.

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has a short memory. I have to remind him that it was the Conservative amendment which brought property right back into the

Constitution, at least momentarily, until the NDP made a deal with the Liberals to remove it in return for NDP support on the Constitution. I know that bothers both Parties because they do not like to be considered in bed together, but there is no doubt in my mind, and I am sure from the anxiety they show here tonight there is no doubt in their mind, that they are just what they are reported to be: a socialist Party interested in the control of the free enterprise system, removal of property rights, and cancellation of 20 per cent of VIA Rail service. They put the Government in office which brought those things about which have been very detrimental—not to mention the National Energy Program—to westerners.

Perhaps they need a few more reminders from a Member from central Canada about the wrack and ruin they have caused in the West. Remember, it was the Conservative Party which fought long and hard to kill the NEP. It was the Liberals who supported the NDP when they asked for removal of property rights so that provincial NDP Governments, some of them in the West, could then control the acquisition of private property and protection of same within our Constitution. It was the Conservative Government, while it was in office for a short nine months, which brought in the Neil report. To refresh the memory of the NDP, that report brought back some semblance of branch lines, the removal of which from the west was being threatened.

Mr. Althouse: Point of order.

Mr. Domm: They are upset again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering if the Hon. Member would explain a little bit about the Neil report. Is that the same report which refused to grant continuation of the line through Wishart in my riding, where the line disappeared because they refused to address the needs of those people?

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, perhaps the Chair could give some consideration to advising Members of the NDP that this is time for debate, not a question period. I am sure that if they could get the unanimous support of their cohorts on the other side of the House, we would welcome a question period on the abolition of the Crow at the conclusion of the comments of every speaker. But I defy them to get in bed again with those on the other side of the House—

Mr. Smith: We do not want them; you can have them.

Mr. Domm: —and get them to agree unanimously to a question period following each ten minute speech. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, that they would have a great deal of difficulty getting that permission from the Chair.

What about the longshoremen, Mr. Speaker? What about the people in unions who support very actively the NDP and its philosophy?

Mr. Crosby: They do not support the NDP.