

In part, Clause 17 reads:

(d) promote reciprocal and other arrangements between the railway companies to facilitate the efficient and reliable movement of grain for the purpose of maximizing returns to producers.

He can suggest until he is blue in the face, he can make arrangements until he is black in the face, but it will not do any good unless the suggestions are carried out.

● (1620)

That is the point we are trying to make in connection with this amendment. The Grain Transportation Agency Administrator not only has the right to suggest and to make arrangements, but to require that they be carried out, "if necessary shall require reciprocal and other arrangements". There is a world of difference between what is said in the Bill and in the amendment.

In case the Chairman of the Transport Committee is not adamant about having this change rejected, I would suggest some reasons why he might listen to these reasons and change his mind. After all, he comes from the other end of the country. I do not hold that against him, but he does not have the direct experience in the grain business which people in the West have had. That comes only from being a farmer in the West.

We hear the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) talk about double-tracking. Some people laugh about double-tracking from Winnipeg to Vancouver. I do not laugh at anything because I have seen over the last few years that anything can change. I can understand why there is laughter when we talk about double-tracking the whole area because the entire area from Winnipeg to Vancouver is not the problem. There are problem points where it should be done. When a minister of highways is dealing with the building of a highway or exchanges, he does not go from one end to the other. There may be something at one end which has a hundred times more traffic. You pick out the trouble points, correct those and then correct the other areas as the traffic requires it.

This is what we should be doing with our railway system. For example, double-tracking is required in some parts of the Rocky Mountains. I do not agree with some of the CP routes. I did not agree with them destroying part of the beautiful Village of Lake Louise. I said that in the House and at the Transport Committee hearings. However, I agree with the objective of moving the grain faster through the mountains and other difficult areas.

I have had letters from people pointing out that from Alberta to Vancouver there is already double-tracking. One is the CN line and the other is CP. Some constituents have asked why we do not make these lines one way. We would then be able to move three times the amount of traffic. That is the case with highways. A two-lane highway can move X number of vehicles per hour. A divided highway, which would not cost that much more, would move three or four times that amount of traffic.

The same is true of the railways. Engineers know these facts. There should be authority, at least during certain times

Western Grain Transportation Act

of the year when all traffic goes one way, to have both lines, or at least sections of them, going one way. Why not have a two-way system at certain times of the year, having the CN line going one way and the CP line the other way? Traffic could increase tremendously.

I know there would be some objections. I know the hair on CP's head would stick straight up, if it has any hair left. Perhaps it is like me and does not have much left. In any event, CP would not like that at all. If the Administrator said he had the authority and it was the sensible thing to do, rather than having the grain standing in boxcars, the glut of grain could be moved. That would make a real difference.

When there are West Coast strikes, the grain farmers bear the brunt because the grain cannot be loaded into ships. It is not the Government, the owners on the coast or the elevators that take the brunt. It is the grain farmer who loses. He pays the extra that has to be paid, in some years up to \$18 million.

We hope that a strike will not occur again. However, if that should happen, the Administrator, once the strike is settled, should be able to get the hopper cars to the port as quickly as possible so that we do not lose our markets. During one strike we could not move our barley. The ships sat in Vancouver harbour for many days. Finally they moved to United States ports to load the barley. We never got that pearl barley market back. We lost it because we accommodated those who had gone on strike on the coast. We forgot all about the grain producer. He is the one who has had to bear the brunt.

The Administrator should have authority to look after the interest of the grain producer. That should be his prime consideration, not to accommodate the railway or put up with the arrogance of the CPR. The grain must be moved, and there is a way to move it.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, you are indicating I have only one minute left. I have at least nine other topics. I will hold them for another part of the debate. Each and every one has to do with the duties of the Administrator. In closing, I say, let us get the Administrator. Let us not give him just a pretty job, but let us give him the tools to do the job so that he can insist on what is right being done, and order it to be done if there is no co-operation from the railways.

Mrs. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of amendment No. 33 which concerns the Administrator of the Grain Transportation Agency. We are pleased that our colleagues in the Conservative Party are at last seeing the light as far as co-operative integrated planning is concerned. It is surprising that they have moved from their free enterprise, free competitive kinds of principles and are actually interested in integrated planning, in this case in order to make the best use of rail cars. We are surprised that the Liberals have not seen the light and recognized this as a sensible plan to make the best use of our resources at a time when we are trying to improve the rail system across Canada.

The motion recommends the exchange of cars between the railways in order to increase the efficiency in the movement of