

*Provision of Moneys to CNR and Air Canada*

Canada. In these circumstances it is almost a disgrace that a company which has been dealt with so generously should have the gall to apply to the Canadian Transport Commission for permission to abandon its passenger services. In my opinion it is time we looked at the question of the CPR.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but as I understand it this bill is intended to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the CNR and Air Canada. I would ask the hon. member to relate his remarks to the subject of the CNR and Air Canada.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, I shall follow your advice, though it seems to me it is impossible to discuss transportation adequately without discussing all forms of transportation, including both railways. In my opinion, one of the reasons we have to deal with this bill today, concerning the advancing of money to the CNR and Air Canada, is that we have failed to develop a transportation policy or a transportation system which would use all forms of transportation at their most efficient levels. This is something we must do or we shall be faced by bills of this kind not only in 1969 but in every year to come.

● (9:10 p.m.)

As I have said, the CNR has in my opinion done an excellent job in the field of moving freight and passengers, and it ought to be commended. It has accomplished this since 1952, since when its work force has been reduced by more than 40 per cent. However, there are a number of problems in respect of the CNR with which I must deal, although not at great length. One problem has occurred every year since I have been here. Every year I had hoped the government, which always promises sympathetic consideration, would take action to settle this serious problem. Every year we have been disappointed. I refer to the very serious problem resulting from the rapidly increasing cost of living of retired employees of the CNR and their inability to live at any kind of decent level on the pensions they receive.

Since my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) came here many years ago, he has been a constant and frequent advocate of an increase in the pensions of retired employees of the CNR. This is not surprising since the city he and I represent has one of the largest groups of

[Mr. Orlikow.]

CNR employees in the country. When you look at the record and the figures in respect of the treatment provided retired CNR employees, you must as a Canadian citizen hang your head in shame. According to a report filed in answer to a question asked by my colleague, 388 retired CNR employees are still receiving a pension of less than \$25 a month; 639 CNR pensioners receive between \$25 and \$29 a month, and 1,300 employees receive between \$30 and \$39 a month. There are 1,062 pensioners receiving between \$40 and \$49 a month; there are 7,715 retired CNR employees receiving a pension of between \$50 and \$100 a month.

As a result of these low pensions, CNR employees continue to pile up pension fund contributions. The government of Canada has failed to provide an adequate pension for CNR employees. At the same time, the CNR uses the money contributed by employees to the pension fund for investment purposes and to finance its regular operations to the extent of \$600 million. This is money owed to employees. It is invested, as are most pension funds. This money is more than enough to substantially increase pensions and reduce the cost to the taxpayers of Canada. Let me join other members of this House in urging the government to direct the CNR to bring its pension plan into a position where it might begin to be fair to its retired employees and enable them to live in some kind of decency.

Let me deal briefly with another question which causes concern to the people of Winnipeg and employees of the CNR. I would use this occasion, within the rules of the House, to repeat the justifiable complaint of the people of Winnipeg regarding the treatment they received from Air Canada. I refer to the way in which that company surreptitiously and illegally moved to Montreal the facilities which were based in Winnipeg. This to a large extent has been accomplished and nothing I can say will alter the decisions which have been made.

There are certain things happening in respect of the CNR organization in Winnipeg which make the people there, particularly CNR employees, feel that we are faced with a repeat performance, this time in respect of the CNR. Let me say, as a member of the House of Commons who is as sympathetic as possible to the problems facing Quebec, that these problems will not be solved by taking work which has been carried out traditionally in other parts of the country and moving it to that province.