

but has destroyed a breed of people. He has destroyed the whole western Canadian ranching industry.

The Crow rate was a birthright of the western Provinces coming into Canada. It had been changed but not for the advantage of western Canada, and it is now being twisted to become an advantage for central Canada. That simply cannot be tolerated by any group of people in the country.

Limiting the Crow advantage to specific new crops is dangerous for the future. We may not be growing wheat in 1990. The genetics of crop production and the engineering of new kinds of crop varieties and species has great potential. There will be crops such as fava beans with 42 per cent protein. There is a potential for the development of new sources of human foodstuffs. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) should never designate what crop we should accept. We should be talking about crop production, period. All new crops come under some benefit of transport because it would be for the enrichment not just of the West but of Canada, and it is important that the Minister have that kind of flexibility.

• (1620)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired. The Hon. Member may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. There does not appear to be unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue? There is not.

Mr. Malone: No one said, no.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. If there is unanimous consent, the Hon. Member may continue.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, because of the generosity of the House, I will make only one more point. I do want to make one extra point while the Minister is here. In the present legislation the restriction of Crow advantage going to any new lands is a regressive proposal because the great potential for the development of new lands is in northern Canada, northern Manitoba, northern Saskatchewan, northern Alberta and northern British Columbia. Those areas are the places where we have the greatest capacity for the development of new farm lands in this country. Forty thousand children a day in the world under the age of five die of starvation. The greatest of all needs in the world is for food production. For the Minister to take the position that the Crow advantage will exist only on the present cultivated acres and not expand itself to more newly developed acres is simply wrong in terms of world conditions. The fact is that those northern areas which have the potential for opening up are the very areas, for reasons of high cost in the development of those lands, which need the Crow benefit in order to be viable. To deny that sets us back for decades, requiring an enormous increase in the price of cereal production in order for those food-producing lands to be opened.

I want to thank the House for its indulgence in allowing me to put that extra point on the record. I would like to say also that this legislation really requires a one-hour speech from

Western Grain Transportation Act

every Hon. Member from prairie Canada. We should not be limited to only ten minutes and, most important, we should not be under closure. Our debate should certainly not be shut off without the benefit of an analysis which comes from representatives duly elected. There should not be this chasing around for a four-year period by the Minister of Transport trying to get across policies in some vague, unknown forum when the House of Commons is being denied the opportunity to come to grips with the legislation itself, because he is always at press conferences and out in Winnipeg making his announcements. If this legislation is in trouble, it is not in trouble because of the House of Commons. It is in trouble because of the process which the Department of Transport followed, which would put any major piece of legislation in trouble. If one chases all over the country for four years, making one's announcements everywhere but where one could see the facts, I guarantee there would be trouble on this, the Constitution, health changes or anything else. Naturally there is trouble. Trouble follows the very troublesome way of bringing it forth. That is what Parliament is here for, and no wonder the Minister is in the situation where he now thinks he has to do what he has to do simply because he did it wrong in the first place. In the final analysis, this legislation should be voted against by every Hon. Member from all parts of Canada, because the damage is not done just to the West but everywhere.

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone), my colleague, when he says that it is absolutely unnecessary and shameful that closure was introduced on the second reading of Bill C-155 this afternoon. If I recall correctly, Sir, the debate on this matter only started on Thursday last, and it went on during the short day on Friday. It is pretty obvious that the Government already had its plans laid down when it introduced closure on second reading this afternoon when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) rose in his seat and said that despite the fact that we only have some ten minutes in which to state our point of view, even that privilege is to be denied to the many Members from western Canada to whom this matter is of the gravest importance.

Had closure been brought in just three years ago, Mr. Speaker, there would have been public outrage at its use after only two days of debate on second reading on as important a matter as the Crow rate. What has happened is that the Liberal Government has used closure and time allocation so many times that the public has become inured to it. It has become a matter of routine procedure, and that is something which I certainly do not like to see. I believe that an issue of this importance deserves much more than two days' debate in this House.

You might ask, Mr. Speaker, why the Hon. Member for Western Arctic would want to speak on the Crow rate. I would like to believe that I may be able to offer something. I can look at this from above, so to speak, from a superior point of view, geographically if not intellectually. There would seem to me,