

Western Grain Transportation Act

why they do not invite the Leader of the Progressive Conservatives to make a speech. We would all like to hear a speech by the Leader of the Progressive Conservatives.

Mr. Fisher: You will never get any ideas from that.

Mr. Ogle: We would like to hear where that Party stands. I would like to hear some of his Irish wit, Mr. Speaker. He and I share the same Irish background. I would like him to come in and give us a clear statement of where the Progressive Conservative Party stands on the Crow Bill.

An Hon. Member: You have the wit and he has the blarney.

Mr. Ogle: I do not see any reason why he should not do that. That is my last remark on this amendment, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to seeing the Leader of the Progressive Conservatives come in and address the House.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, what we are discussing today is the difference between Motion No. 39, the Progressive Conservative amendment, and Motion No. 40, the NDP amendment. Basically, the difference between them is that Motion No. 39 is a political amendment and Motion No. 40 is a legal amendment. Motion No. 39 is in keeping with the cosmetic, political, both sides of the fence approach that the Progressive Conservatives have taken throughout the debate on the Crow, while Motion No. 40, the NDP amendment, is consistent with the comprehensive and consistent defence we have made of the Crow rate and the Canadian Wheat Board throughout the debate on the future of the Crow rate. That is the difference between the two. One is designed to create the appearance of protecting the Canadian Wheat Board, while the other is designed to implement the reality of protecting the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Once again I find myself on my feet in these debates about amendments, pointing out again that the Progressive Conservative Party is again failing to stand with the NDP for the protection of the Canadian Wheat Board. Only last week I spoke on a similar amendment where the Conservatives failed to stand with the NDP for the protection of the Canadian Wheat Board. I do not know if you were in the Chair at that time, Mr. Speaker, but I pointed out at that time that it was no surprise to us in the NDP because the Canadian Wheat Board is the symbol of orderly marketing for many people, that the Conservatives would want subtly—not vociferously and not too enthusiastically because they know the political consequences of that, but subtly—to erode both the reality of that symbol and the symbolic nature of the Canadian Wheat Board.

When it comes down to it, the Conservatives cannot ideologically live with orderly marketing. They have always had a problem with that. It goes against the neo-Conservative strain in the Party. Historically, there may have been Conservatives who were in favour of orderly marketing and who co-operated in setting up many of the institutions in the country for overcoming the inadequacies of the marketplace and for protecting producers and consumers, et cetera. What now prevails

in the Progressive Conservative mind is not that conservatism of years gone by. Of course, I am being overly flattering when I speak of conservatism of years gone by, but it is only to point out that now we have the total ascendancy of that neo-Conservative ideology in the Progressive Conservative Party which sees orderly marketing as something to be overcome, to be destroyed; they see it as an evil. Anything that interferes with the marketplace is to be regarded as undesirable.

The Conservatives cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. Do they want to preserve the Canadian Wheat Board and the orderly marketing it represents? If they do, why do they not stand with us and support an amendment that actually does that, rather than simply creating the appearance of doing that?

Earlier in the debate the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) said he was getting tired of listening to the NDP. We were glad that he was not so tired that he could not get up to speak on the amendment, because we always enjoy his interventions. We are glad that we provoked him into using up ten minutes. He told a story about what the Canadian Wheat Board had done to a couple of farmers. I had an opportunity to check with some of my colleagues who know more about the details of the case and I am told that he did not tell the whole story. I know that is unusual for the Hon. Member for Bow River, but he did not tell us that the farmers in question had delivered more grain to the elevators than their quota. He did not tell us that because the grain was there it was holding up the ability of many other farmers—

Mr. Taylor: Baloney!

Mr. Blaikie: —in the area to get their grain to market. We did not hear that from the Hon. Member. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is heckling me. He says I am not taking the side of the producer. What I am trying to do is take the side of the details, of the truth of what actually happened in this case so that all of us can make an independent judgment about what we think is really the case. We did not get that from the Hon. Member for Bow River. We just got a very selective interpretation of what the truth was about that particular case. That is no surprise. It is in keeping with the way in which Conservatives are always looking for ways to distort the facts and undermine the credibility of institutions like the Canadian Wheat Board. In effect, what the Hon. Member for Bow River did, particularly now that I have had the opportunity to check the rest of the story—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member knows nothing about the case and now he is generalizing. Tell the truth and stop talking about the corporations. Have a heart for the little man for a change.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I am overcome with the piety of the Hon. Member for Bow River. That was not a point of order and I was not talking about the corporations. I was talking about what actually happened in that case. Hon.