

Canadian National Railways

Crown corporation has designed its plans and had moved to implement them without public awareness and without public debate. This is causing a tremendous amount of job uncertainty. I am not saying that the move to bring in a regional carrier system is wrong. In many ways it is a great move, a tremendous move, but the people holding jobs must be informed and the public has to be made aware so that it will understand what is taking place. It is things like this which cause uncertainty among people.

Everybody with a grain of sense knows that if the morale of an organization is low, productivity will also be low. Hundreds of pieces of research have demonstrated this conclusively. That is what is happening in the CNR, and I am afraid the same attitude is permeating Air Canada. I do not wish to speak at this time about the air tragedy in Toronto. I have not received much response from the events of yesterday, including the release of the flight recorded conversations. This may well raise an issue later on.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not want the remarks I have made today to be taken as just a few remarks in the House of Commons made only to hear myself talk. That is not my intention. The Minister of Transport is not in the chamber. All the big guns in the cabinet are not here, with the exception of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald). I ask that they and the CN officials in the gallery take my questions to the general manager of CNR, and to the regional or district manager in the province, so that a full and total response may be made with respect to railway services in the province so far as freight is concerned, particularly east-bound freight out of Bishop's Falls, and new and better systems for wood hauling and ballast trains. We want further information on the bus and dayliner systems and on the whole question of transportation across the gulf between Newfoundland and the mainland, which service is seriously impeding the tourist trade in our province.

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make just a brief interjection in this debate. I would not like it to be thought that all hon. members shared the view of the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) that the Canadian Transport Commission is acting in a sneaky manner in its attempts to evaluate rail service. The hon. member can correct me if I am wrong in the use of that word.

Mr. Lundrigan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say for the record that the hon. member has quoted me exactly and is right on target.

Mr. Anderson: That certainly takes care of any possible misunderstanding about what the hon. member said. I would like to indicate that the commission, in an area of the country that I come from, with respect to the Esquimalt-Nanaimo Railway, did carry out an extremely open and fair hearing into the conditions of passenger service between Esquimalt and points north on Vancouver Island. There was a tremendous opportunity for citi-

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

zens to present briefs and participate in the hearing. The commission adopted a very openly critical policy, and indeed I might add that the hearings held on this tiny little railway, which carries about 30 people each way every day, were attended by about four times as many people as attended the House of Commons committee hearings held in Victoria to discuss the white paper on taxation.

● (3:10 p.m.)

My only reason for speaking in this debate is to indicate that I disagree with the hon. member with respect to the Canadian Transport Commission, which I feel is doing a very good job. In my area it made every effort to be fair and allow people to express their opinions on the question of discontinuing passenger service.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question? Firstly, was the railroad in question retained? Secondly, could the hon. member for one second stretch his imagination to the point of understanding that we lost a rail passenger system for 500,000 people in the whole province of Newfoundland? Can he understand—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lundrigan: Can he understand it for a moment?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member wants to reply to the question, he may do so.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, it is probably easier for me to reply to the first question than the second. The rail service in this instance was retained. The commission pointed out that the CPR was acting in a deplorable manner in attempting to allow the rolling-stock to be run down. The CPR has one passenger train each way every day which managed to miss one of the CPR's own ships by 12 minutes. The commission was extremely critical of Canadian Pacific.

As far as Newfoundland is concerned and whether I can stretch my mind to understand the situation there, obviously it is difficult for anyone not from that province to understand everything about it. But I would not like the impression left with this House and with those who read *Hansard* that the Canadian Transport Commission, as far as the rest of us are concerned, is a body which is sneaky or underhanded. I think that is a most unfair criticism of people who are not here to defend themselves.

Mr. Lundrigan: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. With reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from the west coast of Canada, an area which I have had the opportunity of visiting and for which I developed a tremendous admiration whilst over there last year. I am sure that in the interest of his province, to which many of my Newfoundland colleagues have gone to make a