

stances as the Commission sees fit. In sub-paragraph (9) it mentions the Administrator. We know that some Members of the Committee believed the Administrator was given too much power. We had an earlier amendment to this Bill which would cause the railroads to enter into reciprocal agreements if it were in the best interests of the grain producers. In sub-paragraph (9)(a) it states:

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—

When we brought in that amendment by itself earlier on it was supported strongly by Members of the New Democratic Party, and I am sure was even supported by some Members of the Government Party, because the reciprocal arrangements are so important to producers to move their grain. We have heard the bleating and the cries about Churchill. This is something that would facilitate and require the railroads to enter into agreements that would be in the best interests of the producers.

There is also a part in this amendment dealing with the need for the Commission to act quickly. There are times when the movement of grain is delayed and, if the railways refuse to co-operate or refuse to enter into discussions, the delay can cause the producers of that grain a considerable loss of income. It is very simply put in this Motion. It reads:

9(b) If the special circumstances of any case so require, the Commission may exercise any of the powers given to it by Sections 59 and 71 of the National Transportation Act and may thereby make an interim ex parte order or orders.

That simply means the Commission can go ahead without having the railroads present, without any of those parties being present, and make an order to remedy whatever circumstance they may need to remedy.

The other thing we do is fairly civil. I think the railroads are treated in the right way, the appropriate manner.

In sub-paragraph 9(c) the motion reads:

Any railway company or person directly affected by an interim ex parte order made pursuant to paragraph 9(b) may at any time within ten days after becoming aware of such order, apply to the Commission to vary, amend or rescind such order and the Commission shall thereupon, on such notice to other parties interested as it may in its discretion think desirable, hear such application—

It does not say they have to, but it says they may. That is only fair.

I come down to another fair and reasonable portion of this motion. It reads in sub-paragraph 9(d):

Any interim order made pursuant to paragraph 9(b) shall apply for a period not to exceed one hundred and eighty days—

That is only reasonable. We would not want it to continue forever in that period of limbo. It goes on to read:

—but any such order may, within the said period, be converted by the Commission to a permanent order.

We think that is consistent with the desires of the producers of grain in western Canada, the people who require the service of the railroads.

### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

I had a friend who reviewed this. He felt that sub-paragraphs 9(a), (b), (c) and (d) would, in his opinion, cause corporate convulsions in the boardrooms of Canadian Pacific and Canadian National. I think that is probably the intent. There is not any reason they should be denied the right to worry about what would happen if they did not perform. The producers have to worry about what happens to them if the railroads do not perform. Therefore, we think we have found a way in this to satisfy all parties.

When you come to the close of the last paragraph which is found in sub-paragraph 10(a), it is a change from Section 262 of the Railway Act, and it reads:

(10)(a) —the Administrator may, on behalf of any grain shipper or group of grain shippers, commence any proceedings before the Commission or the Courts to secure any of the remedies herein provided.

(b) Where any remedy, against a railway company, other than the remedies provided herein, is available to shippers pursuant to this Act, the Railway Act, or the National Transportation Act, the Administrator is deemed to be a shipper—

In closing, I would like to read the definition of shipper that we sought and had accepted in Bill C-155. A shipper means any person, partnership, corporation or organization that enters into a contract with a railway company for the movement of grain.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, may I say I think the Hon. Member mentioned there were a couple of clauses that would cause consternation in the boardrooms of Canadian Pacific Railway. The last time the Conservatives caused consternation in the boardrooms of Canadian Pacific Railway, I think the only time, was when it was revealed that Sir John A. Macdonald was taking money from Canadian Pacific in the Pacific scandal in the last century. The Conservatives are still taking money from the Canadian Pacific Railway. They are not about to upset the apple cart.

This amendment is a piece of fluff. That is what it is. It is a piece of fluff. It, in many ways, exposes the Conservatives' approach to the Crowsnest Pass rate and to Bill C-155. When you cut through all the verbiage, it does nothing to the Bill. In fact it changes nothing in terms of the existing legislation.

The provisions contained within this Conservative amendment on the responsibility of the railroads to provide service are already covered under the National Transportation Act. The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) admitted that in his speech. It is already covered under that Act. The amendment shows up the Conservatives' approach to this legislation. It is all form and has no substance.

Faced with an aroused electorate—and perhaps we should explain this to some of the Liberal Members across the way so they know what is happening here tonight—on the Prairies that is adamantly against changing the Crow rates, the Conservatives have a position that is essentially the same as the Liberals when you really get down to it, and the Tories are reduced to moving amendments of this nature. It is all fluff and no substance. Because they have nothing to say, they end up saying basically nothing at all. Instead of addressing them-