

*Supply—Transport*

step was taken in this direction recently. It was stated that the Minister without Portfolio was to be given some responsibility in this department. Why not go further and make him associate Minister of Transport for civil aviation? I think recognition of this type is due to the air transportation industry in Canada.

I was interested in the many comments which have been made about the Canadian Pacific Railway. Members of all parties have taken a few swipes at this giant corporation. I would point out that since I came here in 1962 members have never had a chance to have a face-to-face meeting with the top management of that railway. I understand we are to have such an opportunity this year. On the other hand, we have had a chance to meet Mr. Donald Gordon and the assorted vice presidents and comptrollers of the C.N.R. each year.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I think these meetings in the transportation committee have been most useful. They provide an opportunity for the management of the C.N.R. to learn directly what members think on certain subjects and they can communicate with members directly rather than in a roundabout way through the minister. If you will look at the minutes of the transportation committee, Mr. Chairman, you will see some of the topics which have been discussed with Mr. Gordon and other senior officials of the C.N.R. Among them was the question of priority for railway facilities in ports, for hotel operations, passenger railway service, and the position of the C.N.R. in the trucking industry. These are the sort of things which members have been bringing up during the past few days in connection with the C.P.R.

Some two years ago I introduced a bill, the purpose of which was to provide that any railway company in Canada receiving any public moneys at all should be required to file a report with the Minister of Transport. It was my hope that such a report would be sent to the railway committee where members of parliament could have an opportunity to question the operators of the railway lines. Of course I had the C.P.R. particularly in mind. I recall the debate which took place on my bill at that time. The government members who spoke on this included the hon. member for Labelle, the hon. member for Stanstead, the hon. member for Restigouche-Madawaska and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier-Lasalle. All through their

speeches there were references to snooping into private enterprise, to creeping socialism, and all that type of talk. You would think I had brought in a bill to nationalize the C.P.R. Well, people are coming to that point of view.

The National Farmers Union and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture have declared themselves on this question, and it seems to me that a Social Credit member tonight made some reference to it. However, that was not the purpose of my bill. It was simply to have the management of the C.P.R. come before a committee of the house each year so that members could question the management of that company in the same way as they can question the management of the C.N.R.

I know it has been explained to me that the reason the C.N.R. appears before a committee is that it is a crown corporation. When the government members were talking against my bill two years ago they referred to the fact that the C.P.R. was a private company and that the alternative was a public corporation. The C.P.R. may be a private company but it is a sort of public institution in Canada and it certainly has had a great deal of public support.

I have been interested to note that some of the new Liberal members in this parliament have had their say about the C.P.R. These have included the hon. member for Port Arthur and the hon. member for Renfrew North. I only hope that when my bill comes up again this year—it is Bill No. C-18 on the order paper—I can expect support from them because I think it would be a very healthy thing if the management of the C.P.R. could be questioned by members of parliament each year. Perhaps if they knew they had to come here each year they might mend their ways a little bit, although I am not too sure about that point.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches made about the harbour of Vancouver by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, the hon. member for Vancouver East and the hon. member for Coast-Capilano. I found them very interesting, and the points that all those members made are worth-while points. I understand the minister is going out soon to have a look at the harbour of Vancouver. When he is out looking at the port of Vancouver I hope he will also go and have a look at Vancouver International Airport. There are one or two points I want to bring up in connection with it.