

Transportation

line will be used by human beings. I wish the minister had come to my riding, particularly around the Christmas and New Year holidays. I would say that the coaches we had were the first ever used in Canada. As a matter of fact, for a moment I was sure that they were being shipped to the Saguenay historical society museum when a station master brought me back to earth.

I know that the minister likes a good laugh but there is a limit to ridicule. I am confident that this time my representations will be heard favourably and that I will not have to raise the matter a tenth time.

I also want to call to the attention of the minister the situation of our private trucking companies which are up against the C.N.R. with its own fleet of trucks. In fact, when we subsidize the C.N.R. and, indirectly, its trucks or trailers with the taxpayers' money, we must remember that we are also taxing the trucking companies which employ more people in my area than the C.N.R. Thus we are forcing our private companies to pay the cost of an unfair and illegal competition. The new legislation must therefore prevent such injustice.

I also pointed out to the minister on other occasions some hypocritical methods used by the C.N.R. on passenger trains running between Montreal and Dolbeau, particularly with regard to sleeping cars. A few years ago, accommodations cost \$5, then \$7 and today \$9. That is more than the price of the ticket. You will be told that the \$9 includes \$2 for the meal, but what if the passenger does not eat—indeed what if he cannot eat—in fact, the train leaves Montreal at 9.30 p.m., long after supper time, and in the morning, when you wake up, in Roberval or in Saint-Félicien, there is neither kitchen nor cook. For the return trip, it is even worse, since we arrive in Montreal at 7.10, and coffee is served at eight o'clock. I say "coffee" because I had the experience once: when I came in to the dining-car at seven o'clock, I was told that there was no more coffee.

• (5:20 p.m.)

If this is not deluding the public hypocritically, I wonder what all that means. Where are those truly responsible in the Canadian National?

Furthermore, what effect will this bill have on interprovincial transportation? Mr. Chairman, on this point, I would simply like to quote an article which appeared in *La Presse* today, the 26th of January, pointing out that

Quebec had protested to Ottawa about that. I trust that the minister received this protest, since we can read this.

The federal bill to define and implement a national transportation policy for Canada prompted strong protest from Quebec to the federal government.

That is what Quebec premier Daniel Johnson said yesterday in the legislature in reply to the leader of the opposition, Mr. Jean Lesage.

Mr. Jean Lesage had asked the premier to table the correspondence he had exchanged with the federal Minister of Transport, and Mr. Johnson replied that he could not, unless he received permission to do so from the minister himself. That is as it should be, it is legal, because that is what we are told here when a question is asked about a third party; I believe the Quebec premier was right in giving such an answer. On the other hand, the attack by the Leader of the Opposition was nothing but boastfulness and hypocrisy.

I hope the present minister saw to it that an answer was forwarded to the Quebec premier as soon as he received this protest, because I sincerely feel that the Quebec government is very worried at present, and has good reason to be, in view of what has been happening these last few years.

Repeating that he had sent a letter of violent protest to Ottawa, Mr. Johnson said, and I quote from the newspaper:

—the bill, to which Mr. Lesage had given his approval while in Ottawa, represented a "mouse-trap" which the Union Nationale government had continuously rejected before 1960.

He went on to say that clause 5 of the bill contained a provision enabling the federal authorities to take over provincial jurisdiction in the transportation field.

Now then, we would not want to pass a bill providing more mouse-traps, thus placing Quebec in an even more difficult position.

I want to put one last point on the record—since words come to pass and writings remain—with respect to newspaper reports on increased Canadian Pacific Railway profits. No doubt all hon. members have read this report. For the month of November, Canadian Pacific Railway revenues amounted to \$48,103,659, with expenditures totalling \$43,880,358, leaving \$4,223,301 in net profits for one month. The report goes on to state the profits, revenues and expenses covering an 11-month period. From January to November, 1966, railway revenues amounted to \$505,392,223, with expenses totalling \$461,859,497 giving a net profit, for 11 months, of \$43,532,726.