

to stand up in this House and explain to us their reasoning for this particular clause. When they do not do so it just increases the fear which the people of western Canada have about this Bill.

Is it the Government's intention and secret agenda that the Wheat Board should in time be whittled down, that its role should be eroded? Is this the secret agenda? If it is not, then surely it is up to Government Members to stand up and say "No, it is not; this is the reason for it and we do not think you are right on this". Or they might stand up and say: "We think you have a valid point; it is certainly not our intention to erode the ability of the Wheat Board to allocate cars and we think you have some good arguments. Yes, we will accept your amendment." But at least they can stand up and say something if they have any guts at all, Mr. Speaker.

● (1140)

These two amendments, Mr. Speaker, Motions Nos. 39 and 40, are pretty similar. I prefer Motion No. 40 because it is a little bit more specific concerning other Acts and regulations which empower the Canadian Wheat Board to allocate cars. But essentially both motions try to accomplish the same thing, that is, to guarantee the Canadian Wheat Board has and retains the power to allocate grain cars.

I maintain that this Bill is an attack upon western Canadian agriculture as we have known it. It attacks the rate which farmers will have to pay for the movement of grain. It attacks the Wheat Board and the Wheat Pools. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), says, it attacks a way of life. The authors of this Bill have a different motion about what agriculture in western Canada should be. It is a motion which runs parallel to those who advocate the grain exchange and the break-up of the co-operative system, the collective method which has been developed both in pooling of resources and of marketing.

I see by your motions, Mr. Speaker, that my ten minutes on this particular motion have lapsed. I just wish to say that I hope at least one Government Member will stand up and address himself to this amendment. Give us the reasoning why they are either in favour of or opposed to this amendment. At least show some courtesy toward my constituents and others in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta and let them know why the Government is doing what it is doing in this particular clause.

**Mr. Flis:** Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member would read the transcripts of committee hearings and previous debate on this motion, he will find his answer there. That is why we cannot prolong this kind of filibustering. It has all been said, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. de Jong:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I fail to see what the point of order was. I am asking him to stand up here in the House right now and address the Canadian public. Is it necessary for members of the public to go to committee hearings and read committee reports? Let us not be so devious. Stand up right now.

### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

**Mr. Flis:** You should have attended the committee hearings. Where were you?

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on Motion No. 39. While we support this motion, we prefer Motion No. 40 which deals with the same topic only in a more detailed way. I wish to express my disappointment that the Minister is not in the House because this is an important piece of legislation.

**Mr. Blais:** Then why don't you deal with it as being important?

**Mr. Parker:** But he is not here.

I have worked for the railways for many years and have seen what they do regarding their commitments to the transportation of various types of grain. This is why I think these two motions are very pertinent to this legislation. The Government is going to change a major piece of legislation which deeply affects western Canada. I can remember in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s when railway workers waited day in and day out for wheat contracts to be signed with other countries so that their very jobs would be guaranteed. The fact is that this legislation could break down the authority of the Wheat Board. I refer to commitments made.

When the Conservatives were in Government, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) made agreements with the railways for upgrading of railway stock. I have seen some of that upgrading take place. Some of it was done with a stencil brush. They stencilled on the side of a car that this car has been upgraded, and I can say now that I did not see the actual work take place. Is that the kind of thing we want to see taking place, which the prairie farmers are going to have to pay for? Right now in my riding there are cars designated for upgrading of branch lines and it is stencilled right on the side. If this clause was in place they could see where these cars have been used. They are being used not only on the upgrading of branch lines but we see them out on western Canada on the main lines and in other areas. If that is what the Wheat Board wants and the administration works for it, it should be done through proper inspections and with proper authority.

Regarding the various types of wheat being shipped, I think it is imperative that the Wheat Board have some say in what grain is going to be shipped. I have seen grain sit for as long as two or three weeks on a siding because it was the wrong grain, the boats were not there to take the grain and the ports in Vancouver could not hold it. It is imperative that there be some kind of communication between the Wheat Board, the railways and the ports, and that must be through the Wheat Board. If this is not done, we are going to have the Cargills, the Richardsons and the Continental groups walking in and making a profit on the backs of the farmers. I know the Conservatives would support that kind of a process because they do not believe in orderly marketing. Well, we will not stand for that and this is why we feel it is so imperative that the administration have the authority to ensure that the equipment is being utilized properly.