

Vancouver was initially built on CPR-owned land; in other words, land given by the Canadian public to the CPR in the subsidies. By 1955-56, the CPR had realized \$500 million net from the sale of land. It then turned over the remainder of its holdings to a holding company, Marathon, and in 1981 Marathon reported profits of \$24 million.

Canadian Pacific Limited, which is the same company as the CPR only with a name change, is the largest and richest corporation in Canada today. In 1981 its profits were \$485 million on assets of over \$16 billion. Its rail operation is one of the most lucrative and one of the most stable sources of profit with \$127 million in profits for that year, despite cries of Crow-induced poverty and the ravages of inflation. That is a preposterous cry with profits at that level. I again quote John Gallagher "To Kill the Crow":

The far-flung empire and vast earnings of Canadian Pacific Ltd. are a direct result of the grants in land, resources, money and business opportunities given to the company by the Canadian people. Despite the efforts of the company to disguise itself, to separate its various parts from one another, to obscure its links to the past, it cannot escape its obligations. It's almost pathetic to see a company with profits of more than \$2 billion in five years shamelessly claim that it does not have the revenues needed or investment in rail capacity in an attempt to wheedle public assistance. All of its assets come from transportation activities and the gifts given to the company to provide and maintain more transportation activities. There is no other source. Yet the company brazenly claims that it cannot fund improvements to the railway at the same time that it sends off \$1.16 billion to the United States to buy a paper company and set aside \$5 billion for its money-losing airline. The company is clearly in violation of the original charter—

● (2220)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair regrets to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to her has expired. She may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There appears to be unanimous consent.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, there is not unanimous consent. Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I should like to start by saying that the remarks of the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) reminded me of a very whiny little boy. When I used to go to school in northern Saskatchewan, if a guy was losing the ball game he would take his bat and ball and go home. Even the tone of the Hon. Member's voice and the way he whines, talking of a problem he knows nothing about, irritated me to a great extent. I wish he would listen now instead of speaking to one of his front-bench caucus colleagues, because I should like him to respond and show people across Canada that he knows nothing about Bill C-155 and, in particular, even less about the Crow rate. In no way should he consider

Western Grain Transportation Act

himself a candidate for the Committee that will study Bill C-155. We want someone in the Chair who will be objective and take into consideration not only the wishes of the railway companies like the CPR and the grain companies like Cargill, but also the wishes of grain farmers throughout Canada. We want this to be a special Committee. We would like to see two NDP Members on the Committee in order to provide some kind of fairness and to offer us an opportunity to move and second motions within our own group in Committee to make changes.

We also want the Committee studying Bill C-155 to be able to travel across Canada. The Committee should have an opportunity to hear not only people who can afford to come to Ottawa and sit here for a few futile hours, if the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi is the chairperson, but also to travel across the country and hear from those people who cannot afford to come here—people who are the producers of the grains that the Bill so drastically affects.

I strongly oppose Bill C-155 because of the conglomeration of things it contains. It is an omnibus Bill with three main features. The first is the upgrading of the rail line system; second is the leasing of the coal lands; and third is the statutory rate itself.

We in the New Democratic Party believe the Bill should be broken up into at least those three separate and distinct parts. We see the need to develop a more efficient and better transportation system throughout the country, particular in areas of western Canada where the rail is so important in getting the primary product, the grains, to the processing plants and to the ports for export markets.

I think of a situation in my own area where a branch line goes into Meadow Lake. Hopper cars do not go into the delivery point there where there are about one million bushels of grain stored because the track is not heavy enough to support a fully loaded hopper car out of that point. There is a need to upgrade the transportation system. We do not think the cost of upgrading the track should be borne by the grain producers many of us represent. We have been trying to convince the Government that Bill C-155 will be very detrimental to their interests.

It must be remembered that even if the rail transportation system to the West Coast is upgraded by the year 1990, when the full impact of the new statutory rate will be felt, less than 20 per cent of the volume of traffic to be hauled under that rate will be grain.

The CPR has asked the people of Canada for \$500 million to upgrade the rail transportation system, while at the same time it has drained that \$500 million from its other subsidiaries for CP Air to buy a new fleet of aircraft. That is just robbing the people of Canada many times over. As the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenview (Ms. McDonald) pointed out, the subsidiaries and the CPR itself have derived all their wealth from the handsome cash grants given at its beginnings, and from the land grants of some 43 million acres.