

Canadian National Railways

consideration of the statute. The minister promised that eventually he would make some report to the house in that regard.

When we were discussing the resolution I indicated that unless there was some change in pattern either of budgeting or in custom and business done by the road the first four months operating experience of 1960 would show that the Minister of Finance would find that his budget calculations would be upset to the extent of \$41 million. I related that to his very slender budget prospect of a surplus of \$12 million and that, of course, was not picked out of the cocked hat.

At the resolution stage I pointed out that this was only one bill for capital requirements that would be presented this year on behalf of the crown company. I also pointed out that after our committee had given considerable study to the capital budget of Canadian National Railways we were presented by the government with another bill which involved a capital expenditure on behalf of the Canadian public of about \$100 million for the Toronto terminal and for, I think, access facilities to the terminal. When I raised these points last week I did not get much satisfaction on the question why most of the expenditures for the Toronto terminal were not presented to parliament in a bill such as we have tonight. I asked why there was a difference in terminal costs of a capital nature in Toronto as compared with capital costs for terminals at Montreal, Moncton, Winnipeg and at other points that had hitherto always been taken care of in a bill similar to the one we have before us at the present time.

One of the reasons why I was curious about this was that a parliamentary committee was set up to examine the capital requirements of Canadian National Railways, its operating budget and, as I say, its capital expenditures and after it had finished its business we received from this government with respect to terminal requirements at Toronto a new bill altogether, something that we did not hear about when we had the opportunity to examine the officers of Canadian National Railways in a less formal manner in a committee of this house. An explanation of that has not yet been advanced. I think it should be.

I must indicate to all my colleagues that in the debate on the resolution stage prior to the introduction of this bill I had showed that the officers of Canadian National Railways were rather anxious to terminate their services before the parliamentary committee and get back to head office in Montreal. I have not the page references in *Hansard* before me but I recall that I was interrupted

in my remarks by some hon. member who said, "Oh, oh". I said that perhaps in this respect I am understating the anxiety and desire of the executives of Canadian National Railways to be relieved of this inquiry and get back to Montreal.

I do not want to retract too much with respect to this statement, Mr. Speaker. I think it is well known that this examination of the accounts of this important crown company is all too hasty. It has always been that way. I do not say it is any different under the new regime from what it was under the old; but when I emphasize the aspect of understatement I feel I owe an apology to the vice president of Canadian National Railways, Mr. Dingle. At the committee meetings this session I raised the effect that certain capital expenditures had on the employees of Canadian National Railways in certain divisional points in the riding of Kenora-Rainy River. I want to say that while the committee itself was not prepared to receive evidence from the national and regional offices of the employees affected by this form of capital expenditure or automation, or whatever you wish to call it, when I reflect upon what I said last week at the resolution stage I think it was unfair perhaps to the vice president of the road, Mr. Dingle.

The committee would not listen to the union representatives or to the representatives from the community of Sioux Lookout, but I must say it was unfair because Mr. Dingle, vice president, was quite willing and anxious to stay over another day after our discussions had concluded. He saved the time of those delegations by staying here in Ottawa rather than going to Montreal, or asking them to come to Montreal. In fairness, I think I should make that statement, because Mr. Dingle's services and willingness to meet those people after the committee consideration was concluded were very much appreciated by all concerned.

I believe that we have here one or two items in clauses of the bill which are not similar to items that we normally have. The minister referred to one when he gave an explanation on the resolution stage.

We have here also a reference to certain adjustments which apparently are necessary in connection with relations between this crown company and the government in the government accounts. It relates away back to the 1957 operations. We should have an explanation of that. The minister should indicate whether or not the annual statements of Canadian National Railways for the year concerned, either 1957, 1958 or 1959, make