

cian has the right to interfere with the day-to-day running of a Crown corporation. I am consistent in every way, even when it hurts, and sometimes when a Crown corporation embarrasses us. But I believe that whenever a Crown corporation comes to Parliament with its hat in hand for funds, a legitimate opportunity is provided to consider whether or not we should agree to vote hundreds of millions either in straight money or in loans to enable the corporation to carry on its business. We have a legitimate right to review the general functions of the Crown corporation concerned and to question its attitudes in relation to the attitudes we believe it would be appropriate for it to have.

I am beginning, reluctantly, to forgive Air Canada for the treatment it accorded my own city for a number of years, but this was an example of sneaky callousness in disregard of the wishes of Parliament. The treatment of pensioners is another example of sneaky callousness. Views on this have been expressed by Members of Parliament elected from a considerably more representative set of areas than, I suggest, the directors of Canadian National. Hon. members have said very forcibly that they do not approve the present treatment of some of these pensioners, and have recommended that the railway do something about it. Nevertheless, the company has failed to do anything about this issue. I see nothing wrong in saying that the CNR had better pull up its socks if it expects us to vote hundreds of millions of dollars in order that it may carry on its operations. If the company cannot look after its own people properly, then maybe it should not have \$229 million to play with for capital investment to the end of this year or another \$80 million to play with in the first six months of next year.

Air Canada, a subsidiary of Canadian National, wants \$13 million for engines—I presume it is engines—or equipment of that sort. We do not know whether they have any competence to choose the right type of engines if they have no competence to deal properly with their own people. I am talking about Air Canada as a branch of Canadian National. The CNR has been cavalier in its lack of concern. This is a symptom of many of the troubles which beset us—this bigness which is exemplified by the CN. It is not really important whether a big concern is owned privately or publicly; it is just as frustrating when it is publicly-owned as when it is privately-owned. It is a case of bigness making people impervious to the feelings of the community.

If we are trying to move toward institutions which are less impervious to the wishes of people, one of the opportunities available to us is the occasion on which, once a year, these institutions come to Parliament for money. Now is the time to underline the fact that we are not pleased with the way in which the company is dealing with its pensioners, just as I hope that before very long we shall meet our own responsibilities to pensioners who are more directly the responsibility of this Parliament. I therefore commend to the House the amendment which has been placed before it.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):
Mr. Speaker, in making my annual contribution on the

Canadian National Railways

CNR bill which authorizes the spending of vast sums of money under Bill C-186, I cannot help being reminded of the indiscriminate manner in which the Canadian Transport Commission discontinued rail passenger service in my own province. The events which followed make me shudder, particularly the way in which the interests of the people who required the service, and still require it, were completely disregarded.

These feelings, which are shared by my hon. friends from Newfoundland, is emphasized when I read the reams of paper which are produced, describing in flowery words the objectives of the department. These, at any rate, keep coming full steam ahead—operational objectives, regulatory objectives, development objectives. But the one which strikes hardest home is the sentence about regulatory objectives, which reads as follows:

To balance economic, technical and social consequences resulting from changes in capability or use of transportation services and ensure that socially and economically viable standards of way, vehicle, terminal and operator performance are established and adequately maintained.

Well! The economic justification for discontinuing rail passenger service was that it cost \$900,000 a year, which was supposed to be too expensive. Yet a very short time after the company "blew the whistle", the Canadian Transport Commission issued an order under date of September 23, 1969, specifying a minimum frequency of passenger services. With one quick sweep that must have been waiting to be read as soon as Newfoundland passenger service got the axe, the Transport Commission recommended the lifting of a restraint which for a decade had prevented the railway company implementing any reduction in services on which they had been losing money, thus enabling the commission to order a passenger service to be continued even if it was losing money, in return for a subsidy amounting to 80 per cent of the loss.

It is worth while mentioning that a replacement bus service was initiated—without much planning, it appears to me. I may be wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I believe this was the first time the CNR had gone into the bus business to any extent. I can tell everyone in this House that all their development experts notwithstanding, the company should not be too proud of the job it is doing in response to the ministry objective of meeting public need where it existed, and certainly not to the regulatory objective of ensuring that "socially and economically viable standards of way, vehicle, terminal and operator performance are established and maintained".

How any organization as big as the CNR could institute a bus service with so little thought to the service they were obliged to provide, is beyond all my powers of imagination, bearing in mind their supposed capacity for research into marketing, industrial development, and so on. In introducing a bus service to the people of Newfoundland, they took the attitude: Here it is; use it. If you don't like it, you can lump it. These words have come to the fore in utterances on some issues recently by persons in high places.

This bus service was put into operation without any regard for the people it was to serve. The company