

Deschatelets) who, I am sure you will agree, did an excellent job yesterday in explaining this very difficult piece of legislation.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: Sometimes I think that those who undertake those responsibilities deserve much credit, and indeed praise. As we say in hockey, "he scored a goal" but I am sure he must have had some "assists". I have no doubt he took full advantage of whatever advice and help he was given. I wish I had the same assistance.

I will begin my remarks this afternoon on a note of optimism. I was very pleased to read in the *Montreal Gazette* yesterday a corporate report on the C.P.R., which bore the headline: "C.P.R. net up 25 per cent in year." A little further on the report said:

For the full year 1966 net rail operating income was \$50,219,767 compared with \$40,239,707 in 1965, while gross revenues were \$553,830,250 against \$518,035,410.

There has also come to my attention an article on the 1966 report of Mr. Donald Gordon for the Canadian National Railways, headed, "Passenger revenue up 18 per cent, C.N.R. reports."

In part, the article reads:

The report of over-all improvement in the railway's financial outcome for the sixth successive year came from the C.N.R.'s chairman and president, Donald Gordon. The year-end review will be the last for Mr. Gordon, who steps down from his post on Saturday.

He went on to point out that it had been a very successful year for the Canadian National Railways.

May I say—and I think you will agree with me—that much praise is due Mr. Donald Gordon, who was President of the Canadian National Railways for many years. I believe the public of Canada owe him a vote of thanks, and now that he has retired from the C.N.R. and is taking on other duties, I am sure we all wish him every success in his new work.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: Honourable senators, as the sponsor of this bill explained yesterday, it is five years since we received the report of the MacPherson Commission. During the intervening period there has been much study of that report and much preparation on the

road to the introduction of the bill now before us. A great array of specialists and particularly interested people have followed the progress of its preparation, and surely there is little more information that can be squeezed out of it in the Senate.

Yesterday evening the honourable Senator Deschatelets mentioned that between February and November 1966 a committee met steadily and brought out a report that was voluminous, as I am sure anyone who has tried to analyze or digest it will agree.

Furthermore, when this measure was considered in committee I understand that between 60 and 70 amendments were recommended; and when the bill was before the House of Commons there was lengthy debate, and these amendments were placed before the house and dealt with. So, as I mentioned a moment ago, I feel there is not a great deal that can be added here in the Senate.

I believe it was only right that there should be a thorough study of this problem. Frankly, I think it is one of the most thorough studies I have noted in my experience in Parliament. The members of the House of Commons who took part in the deliberations of the committee and in the debate in the house deserve great praise for the attention they gave this bill and the very serious problems of transportation.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: The Fathers of Confederation 100 years ago recognized transportation as one of our main problems. Perhaps in those days they placed it second only to defence, and also after the cementing or uniting of the two great races into one Canadian nation. Anyway, it was one of the serious problems at the time of Confederation, and for the succeeding 100 years, and it still is.

We all know that Canada is a difficult country in which to arrange transportation. From east to west, from Halifax to Vancouver, there runs a narrow band of inhabited land, in which there was little depth until recently, and the organization of transportation had to be based on the east-west theory.

One of the main arguments in favour of the two Maritime provinces, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, joining Confederation in 1867 was that they would be given proper transportation and connection with the other parts of Canada.

We all know the history of the building of the Canadian National Railways. If it went through Canadian territory the railway had