

believe that this legislation does not only represent a western Canadian issue. The question of the Crow rate is a Canadian issue, because when farmers in western Canada receive extra money for the sale of their crops they can spend that money. They can buy commodities such as refrigerators, automobiles and farm machinery, all of which are probably manufactured in central Canada. The money which comes into Canada from the export sale of grain to the tune of \$6 billion means that this is not purely a western issue. The grain industry is a major economic contributor to this country and one of the engines of growth. We should not be foiled by the examples of Motions Nos. 50, No. 52 and No. 53 which set forth false pretenses of economic principle that would burden us with more layers of bureaucracy that are totally unacceptable.

I conclude therefore by saying that these motions are unnecessary because of the provision for freedom of choice. They would be a burden upon us in terms of paper, bureaucracy and layers of Government becoming involved in the private sector. These motions would have the Government run the private sector and breach the principles that business has a right to manage its own affairs.

● (2120)

Sir, that might be the NDP way to say that Government has the right to tell business how to run its business. That is not the accepted way of the majority of Canadians. They believe there is a position in this country for the individual. They believe—the majority of Canadians—that there is a place in this country for families and businesses to run in accordance with the law that allows them to do with their money that which they believe they should do. But not the Liberals or the NDP. They think Government should be able to dictate to business and say what business should do with its money.

I simply say let us open this up to competition, to different modes of transportation. Not only will it be more efficient, not only will it mean we do not require Governments meddling, it will mean that commodity markets on the Prairies, which do not normally export but want to have value added within the Provinces, can ship their barley to feed lots, to poultry barns—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member, but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat of a pleasure to follow the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone). One could spend all of one's allotted time just going through his remarks and picking up some of the errors and correcting him. Let me deal with a few.

The Hon. Member suggested that the amendments before us, Nos. 50, 52 and 53 are all socialist amendments and interfere with the free enterprise system. I wish to remind the Hon. Member that Motion No. 52 is a Conservative amendment. It is a Conservative amendment which requests that the

information given to the commission by the railways be not kept secret.

Mr. Epp: That is why it is a good amendment.

Mr. de Jong: In other words, this information should be public. Amendments Nos. 52 and 53 are almost identical. One comes from the New Democratic Party and one from the Conservative Party. There are some Members in the Conservative Party who realize that this information should be public and should not be secret. It is true Canadian Pacific Railways is a private company. But there are some Members in the Conservative Party who do believe that information should be public because the decisions of the CPR do have a tremendous effect. Because of the tremendous public effect this company has the public should be aware and have access to that information. It is the friends of the CPR across the way, the Liberal Party, the Liberal Government, who are opposed to making this information public.

Essentially what we are asking for in amendment No. 50, to which the Conservatives are so opposed and about which the Liberals are essentially dead silent, is that we guarantee in legislation that we get what we pay for.

I am amazed when I listen to Members, like the Hon. Member for Crowfoot, who talked as though the CPR were just an ordinary private company carrying on its business and that our amendment really interferes with the operations of that private enterprise and therefore we should not do this. Does the Hon. Member not realize that what we are asking for is that public moneys given to the CPR be spent in a way that benefits the public, that those moneys given to the CPR be spent in the way they are supposed to be? Does that not really make more business sense? I am surprised that Members of the Conservative Party and Members of the Liberal Party, who pride themselves in being good business people, should feel that the public, giving money to this private corporation, should not have the right in legislation to determine that the money indeed gets spent in the way it is supposed to be spent. In other words, that the public gets what it pays for. That is all that we are asking for.

Is this such an outrage to free enterprise? I fail to see it, Mr. Speaker. I think it is irresponsible of a government, whether Liberal or Conservative, to hand out moneys and not ensure that those moneys are spent in a way for which they were paid. To do otherwise is truly irresponsible. Essentially what the Liberals and the Tories want is a blank cheque written for the CPR.

Mr. Epp: Read the motion.

Mr. de Jong: The Liberals want a blank cheque for the CPR. Our good Conservative friends want a blank cheque for CP trucking. The CPR wins both ways.

Mr. Taylor: Baloney.

Mr. de Jong: The CPR wins both ways.

Mr. Taylor: That is more baloney.