

Transportation

The figures are then compared with those of Canadian National Railways, a crown corporation. For the same 11-month period, Canadian National Railway revenues amounted to \$812,309,000 with operating expenses totaling \$802,305,000 leaving a difference of \$10,004,000, which represents the net deficit on railway operations.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am very surprised to note according to those figures, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, with net profits exceeding \$43 million, enjoys the same subsidies as the Canadian National Railways, operating at a \$10 million deficit.

What is being protected through all that? What influence does the Canadian Pacific have with the authorities of the commission that it can get the best lines while benefiting from the same assistance as the Canadian National? Might some of the powers that be in the Canadian National have interests in the Canadian Pacific? Why are some shareholders of the Canadian Pacific going up in the management of the Canadian National?

There, sir, are some of the questions the people of Canada are asking themselves today. The time I am allotted does not allow me to take the wraps off that extremely favoured company, the Canadian Pacific. We had another example yesterday, when a member proposed an amendment to allow municipalities to tax the Canadian Pacific where it operates within their limits. The amendment was negated.

The Canadian Pacific has nearly always been exempt from paying certain taxes. Even the minister, at times, seemed to invite the Canadian Pacific to pay certain taxes in certain places. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the point is not to "invite" that company, because the Canadian Pacific is just an ordinary company like all the other companies in Canada which pay taxes for their presence, but to require the payment of taxes by the Canadian Pacific as a private company. If this bill stipulated that the Canadian Pacific must pay taxes, in view of all the privileges it enjoys, this would not only benefit the Canadian people but it would be fair toward the other companies.

It is incumbent on the government to bring our transportation companies into line and to remind them that they must serve the people not take advantage of the people.

[*English*]

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a brief word about one subject

[*Mr. Gauthier.*]

which the hon. gentleman mentioned. He made reference to certain proceedings that took place in the Quebec legislature yesterday. Strictly speaking, under the rules of our house we are not supposed to import strangers into our debates here, but I am not going to make any point of that. I have the impression that if we in this house talked about the exercise by a provincial legislative assembly of its functions we would be criticized pretty strongly in that assembly.

What I want to make very clear is that although there was very little if any debate in committee on Part III of the bill, that part of the bill respecting extra-provincial motor vehicle transport is completely and exclusively within the jurisdiction of this parliament.

● (5:30 p.m.)

There is absolutely nothing in it which invades in any way anything about which a provincial legislature can legislate. If we are to have any law at all in this country with regard to trucking companies which operate from one province to another or which travel out of a province into another country, that law can be made by this parliament and by this parliament alone. No one else can make such a law because that is the way the constitution reads. We cannot regulate trucking operations which are entirely within a province because that is entirely within provincial jurisdiction. We have never attempted to touch that and are not doing so in this bill. We have no intention in this regard.

With regard to the Motor Vehicle Transport Act passed by this parliament in 1954, the purpose of that act was to fill a vacuum in the law. For many years it had been believed that jurisdiction over all trucking operations, even those crossing from one province to another or even going outside the country, was within the province. This parliament never attempted to make any law regarding that subject matter until the matter was taken to the courts and carried to the Privy Council. The Privy Council decided that parliament and parliament alone could make laws in respect of that matter.

The result was that there was no law at all, because parliament had never made one. At that time I was a very junior member of the government but, as I believe every hon. member here knows, I was a very close personal friend and a former aide, if you like, of the then prime minister, Mr. St. Laurent. I remember very well the discussion which took place at that time about this decision. I