

*Canadian Wheat Board Act*

minister responsible for this piece of legislation should have introduced the related amendments which are before the House now. It is interesting to note that since this bill was introduced, the minister responsible for the Wheat Board has clearly said that the present marketing systems for these grains are not to be included under the Wheat Board now. To quote him specifically, he said:

...if it should be deemed desirable at a future date.

This is what he said outside the House in answer to the questioning of the press. I fail to understand why he has been motivated to include these amendments if he does not consider it necessary at this time to include these grains under the Wheat Board. It has been indicated that a number of farm organizations have been asking for legislation which would bring these particular grains under the Wheat Board, but I fail to hear this kind of request from the producers themselves. In fact, the other day the president of the Palliser Wheat Growers Association said something far different from what the minister said to justify his action. He said on April 25, in Regina:

The Board's sales record in the last decade has not been good in a competitive world market. It's been a record of lost and declining sales in an increasing market—a history of costly storage and interest charges and unsold wheat amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, while the Americans forged ahead in record breaking exports of wheat and in farm income.

Surely these facts are sufficient to question the Board's ability as a sales agency.

On the positive side, he said:

All efforts should be concentrated—

Referring to the government.

—on incorporating proper incentives and business management into the board to save the fast-drowning wheat industry, rather than attempt to pull the buoyant oilseed industry down with the drowning wheat.

The statement that farm organizations want flax and rape on the CWB does not necessarily reflect the desires of flax and rapeseed growers. Some of those in favour are obviously elevator companies who speak for the syndicate at the top and not for the average producer.

I can only agree, Mr. Speaker. May I call it five o'clock.

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION****SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Public Service—Clyne Committee recommendation for withdrawal of right to bargain collectively from certain employees; the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Rowland)—Manpower—Measures to assist science and engineering graduates to obtain appropriate employment—Stimulation of research and development; the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton)—Grain—Wheat—Addition of unused portion of Lift program funds to transitional payments.

[Mr. Thompson.]

• (5:00 p.m.)

[Translation]

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private member's business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions.

[English]

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS****NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION****SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF TRANSIT AUTHORITY**

**Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the expediency of entering into discussion with the Governments of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec on the terms under which a National Capital Region Transit Authority could be created and incorporated by federal charter bearing in mind (a) the inadequacy of public transportation facilities in the National Capital Region (b) the restriction by charter of transit services, both publicly and privately owned, to municipal boundaries (c) the need for long-term planning of an integrated system of rail rapid transit, bus and other means of urban transit (d) the crises developed by the unfair competition provided by public subsidies on behalf of private vehicles (e) the contribution by an efficient, low-cost public transportation system to the balanced economic and social development of the whole National Capital Region.

He said: Mr. Speaker, what I have to say will be brief. The last time this motion was presented there was an excellent debate in the House which can be found in the *Hansard* report of March 6, 1970, pages 4494 to 4504. At that point I indicated the reasons for the motion, what I hoped could be achieved, and argued that within the area which we hope will be designated, by an amendment to Article 16 of the Constitution of Canada, as the National Capital Region to include part of the province of Quebec and part of the province of Ontario, we could use the authority of the federal government, in co-operation with the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and of the municipalities affected, to develop a rational pattern of public transportation for a growing and important metropolitan area.

There have been a few developments since that time which I will just briefly set on the record. One is the announcement by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) that Ottawa and Montreal are to be chosen as the first places in Canada for experimentation with the short take off and landing, the STOL, type of aircraft. This is a product in which Canada hopes to specialize, and which we hope we will develop for a world market. We hope there will be a demonstration between Ottawa and Montreal of the practical feasibility of this type of transportation between two large urban communities. Of course, if we can solve the problem of moving people between communities it is all the more important that we come to some rational means of solving the problem of the movement of people within a metropolitan area.

The second development to which I call attention is the decision of the government of Canada to create a more