

Hon. Mr. Euler: Are you suggesting they are not getting an even break now?

Hon. Mr. Haig: No.

Hon. Mr. Euler: What is the reason they are not getting an even break?

Hon. Mr. Haig: Because they are paying interest on money that is not producing any revenue.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I am referring to the two young men who are being held back.

Hon. Mr. Haig: They are not being held back. They are at the top.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I cannot understand the remark at all.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald: Honourable senators, I have comparatively few remarks to make. I am sure all of us have enjoyed the debate thus far, but I intend to deal only with some of the details of the bill.

The sponsor stated that provision is made for an expenditure of \$307 million. Well, I am glad the bill is going to committee, for I don't see how that figure, which is quite a sizeable sum, is arrived at. Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of section 3(1) of the bill provide respectively for expenditures of \$330,623,000, \$134 million and \$110 million.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Look at the credits. Get the credit side of the picture.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: The three items I have mentioned total \$574,623,000. According to the statement tabled by the sponsor of the bill (Hon. Mr. Haig) there are certain credits; but even with those credits we are providing \$574,623,000. I will not ask the sponsor to give us a further explanation now but I think this point should be cleared up in committee tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Surely.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: As I understood my honourable friend's explanation, the credits are possible ones, but the liabilities might amount to \$574 million.

Now, the honourable gentleman said there was some urgency in passing this legislation, and he said it should have been introduced earlier. Well, I do not know when it could have been introduced, because I understand the bill did not pass the House of Commons until late Thursday afternoon. It was given first reading in the Senate later the same day, and unless the house had sat on Friday or Monday the bill could not have been given second reading before tonight.

It has been said there is great urgency in this, that the Canadian National Railways ran out of money on July 1, and therefore we are asked to rush this bill through second

reading tonight, deal with it in committee tomorrow morning and give it third reading and pass it in the house tomorrow afternoon. Why the rush? The house has been in session since May 12. If the Canadian National Railways ran out of money on July 1, I would like to know how it has been operating until now and why it can't continue to operate until August 14 or 15, which would give us plenty of time to consider the bill.

Honourable senators, this is another example of our being asked to rush a bill through when there is no need to rush it.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: This bill should have come to us a week ago.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: We have had it since last Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: I understand it was received in this house at six o'clock last Thursday afternoon. This is the first time the house has met since then.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: The bill was received here about four o'clock last Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: All right, four o'clock. If the Canadian National Railways ran out of money on July 1, why did the Government wait until August 7 to present the bill to this house, with a request that honourable senators rush it through, because the railway needs the money? I can see no necessity whatsoever for rushing it. In addition the Government has taken upon itself the responsibility of calling officers of the railway to Ottawa tomorrow morning on the assumption that this house will give the bill second reading tonight. Well, we may give it second reading tonight. I am prepared to make my speech now, for I have no reason for holding the bill up, but I do protest against our being asked to rush bills of this kind through this house shortly after they are received here, when there appears to be no urgency whatsoever.

Honourable senators, if the bill goes to committee I think we should get a full report on the financial condition of the Canadian National Railways. I understand that the company lost considerable money last year and that the prospects for next year are just as bad. I think the honourable senior senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) went so far as to say that the railway is going to continue to lose money for all time to come. I do not say this has anything to do with the bill but I would remind him that when the former administration was in power the railway did not lose money every year.

Hon. Mr. Haig: It wrote off \$1 billion.