

was an attack against the three most important economic sectors in my Province, energy, agriculture and tourism.

I submit that the Government does not have the mandate for such an attack on that region of the country. It does not want to listen to people who are sent here as representatives because its instinct is for closure on one of the three most important economic aspects of that region of the country.

Against that background, I rise to speak on this set of motions. The very fact that the Government has 21 Members from eight Provinces and two Territories means that all its other Members come from Quebec and Ontario. They are not regionally representative, not regionally sensitive, and ought to be duty bound to listen to the arguments we put in this House.

● (1250)

The question today is whether or not we should have performance guarantees for shipping grain. The first motion states that that performance guarantee should be limited to the railways. That, Sir, asks the fundamental question, for whom are we performing? I submit that performance is for no one other than the producer. It is not a performance guarantee for governments, so that more paperwork can be checked. It is not a performance guarantee for the international marketplace except as it relates to our economy. It is a performance guarantee for farmers.

If it is a performance guarantee for the farmer, then he must obviously have every link which relates to performance guaranteed to him. There can be no system of performance if you call for performance on only one part of the system. As well, performance ought not to be a question of whether or not we like one of the links of the system. It is the view of some—in this case, perhaps the NDP—that they do not like the railways, but you cannot simply limit performance guarantees to the railways because it will not guarantee performance. Performance must relate to the whole system and its judge and jury must be the producers. Performance guarantees are not a question of morals. Fundamentally, it is purely and simply a question of performance. The farmer ought to be the final judge, and it is for that reason that performance objectives must be established.

There are many aspects to the whole question. I draw to your attention the country elevators, the grain terminals, the shunting yards at the port, the port authorities, the tugboat operators and operating system, international shipping, the St. Lawrence Seaway and, while I mention it last it is certainly not least, organized labour. I can understand the instinct of the New Democratic Party not to have any system which might have some persuasive influence on organized labour. I believe it is the obligation upon us all to recognize that fair and equitable treatment of labour organizations is an imperative part of today's society. However, the fact of the matter is that it is an integral link in performance and you cannot have performance without looking at every aspect.

The New Democratic Party has made much ado about CN and CP buying up trucking fleets on the Prairies. At this point it would not be relevant to this part of the debate to comment

Western Grain Transportation Act

at length on that matter, except to say that we should not have performance guarantees which affect only the railways. If the trucking companies are as bad as the NDP allege, why would we not at least have a generalized performance guarantee system which could expand to the "evil" that Party claims is there? It seems to me it is obvious that we must have performance guarantees which do not apply to simply one unit, but rather to the whole system.

On that basis I would like to submit to you, Sir, the kind of country we would have if we took the present philosophy of the New Democratic Party and applied it to a number of systems governing Canada. In an NDP Bill 101 there would be a performance guarantee for only one link in a chain. In their Bill 102 there would be a performance guarantee for only one of the couplings on a train. In NDP Bill 103 there would be a performance guarantee that elevator doors would open and close at only one floor. NDP Bill 104 would have a performance guarantee that our medical services would keep only one of the organs viable in the human body. NDP Bill 105, a performance guarantee that only one of the sections of a scaffolding would meet safety standards. NDP Bill 106, a performance guarantee that the left side—that is the port side—of all boats must not leak. NDP Bill 107, a performance guarantee that one section of a rope for mountain climbing must be secured. NDP Bill 108, a performance guarantee that one child in each school gets immunization vaccinations. NDP Bill 109, a performance guarantee—and you will notice the NDP bias shows up here, Mr. Speaker—on all engines on the left side of all aircraft. NDP Bill 110, all automobiles and buses shall have performance guarantees on the brakes on the left-hand side.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Malone: The New Democratic Party are now asking about relevance. The relevance is that if we are going to talk about the concept of performance guarantees—and the NDP are taking the view that is important, as well as my own Party—then surely on a question of getting grain to market one cannot say that performance guarantees should apply only to the railway system. We have trucks, country elevators, terminals, shunting yards, the St. Lawrence Seaway. If we are going to have a system of authority and we are going to have performance guarantees, those performance guarantees have to apply to all parts of the system. Certainly, if you ask prairie farmers who they suspect is holding back on their performance, they will be quick to finger the railways. They are not far behind in fingering organized labour. And whether or not that accusation by farmers is correct, if the authority is there for the purpose of giving performance guarantees, it should affect every section of the transportation of grain to port. If it does not, then the final objective of acquiring a system in which we can achieve performance objectives will not be met.

I would like to accept the challenge of the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) who asked who will pay. Perhaps at this point it is not appropriate to say definitively who will pay for the rewards for improved transportation