

Transport Commissioners, the Air Transport Board and the Canadian Maritime Commission.

Honourable senators, I am now coming to the conclusion of my remarks. Before preparing these notes I went over some of the reports of the Transport and Communications Committee meetings in the other place and read as carefully as I could the lengthy debate in the Committee of the Whole, as well as other sources of information; so, if there is one person in this room fully conscious of the incomplete and superficial presentation I have given you, I am the one. However, I think that I have covered the most important features of the bill, and hope that at this stage it will be found satisfactory.

I know that many aspects of this bill are controversial, as the discussion in the other place has shown; but I must remind honourable senators that 34 committee meetings were held, 73 witnesses were heard and 36 extensive briefs were examined on this bill. From the start in committee, and later on in Committee of the Whole, more than 60 amendments—though not all substantive—were made to the bill. This shows that the Government, and especially the Minister of Transport, during all these discussions, kept the door open to any amendment which appeared to be an improvement in the provisions of the bill.

A tremendous amount of work has therefore been done already, and I think it is right to say that all parties have contributed in this effort, and that the debate on this matter in the House of Commons has shown Parliament at its best.

[Translation]

I should now like, if you will allow me, honourable senators, to comment on the criticism published in this morning's *Gazette*—which matter has already been mentioned in the other place. I should then, in closing, like to comment on that criticism with a view to proving that it is not justified. This editorial praised the thoroughness of the bill submitted to you to-day, adding that it should have been brought down years ago. This, of course, seemed to indicate that the Government, having received the MacPherson Report in 1960-61, had been remiss in not having dealt sooner with a bill of such magnitude.

May I point out that that criticism is also shared by the former Government which in fact received the MacPherson Report in 1960-61. But I will try to refute that criticism

aimed at the former Government and the present Government by saying this: if the former Government, upon receipt of the MacPherson Report, had introduced such a piece of legislation, we would not have today a bill as complete as the one we are introducing. As a matter of fact, I proved that the MacPherson Report sets up some general principles. However, it was not enough to make up a bill such as this one. That was true also of the first bill introduced by the Government in 1964 which, in our opinion, was only a major amendment to the Railway Act.

What I want to prove is that when a government introduces such a wide ranging bill which might serve Canadians for generations to come, one mistake must be avoided and that is to improvise, to go too fast.

I feel that we now have a complete bill on transportation. Of course, we owe it to the MacPherson Commission report. We owe it also to all the suggestions and advice given in all the studies made by transportation experts. I wish to say also that if after those studies the Government agreed to 70 amendments—not all of them major ones—it shows that the Government kept an open mind about all the suggestions likely to improve the bill which is now before us.

[Text]

Honourable senators, one distinguished member of the official opposition in the other place—I think it was the member for Qu'Appelle—in the course of his remarks said that he believed that the great majority of the people of Canada are willing to give this policy of competition a try. I would go a few steps further in my appreciation and say that although the bill may not solve all our transportation problems, it will permit the Government for the first time to contemplate not only short-term but long-term solutions to those transportation problems. It is for this reason that I am happy to propose it for your approval.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Brooks, debate adjourned.

JOINT COMMITTEES

CHANGES IN COMMONS MEMBERSHIP

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that messages had been received from the House of Commons to acquaint the Senate that the name of Mr. Fairweather had been substituted for that of Mr. Coates on the Special Joint Committee respecting Mr. Justice Landreville; that the names of Mrs. Rideout and