

*Adjournment Debate*

was the Canadian public and this House to believe? Someone was misleading the House.

On February 21, 1975, the next day, at page 3439 of *Hansard*, I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) what the correct answer was with regard to the rate of interest on this soft loan to Communist Cuba. Although I worked hard at it, you will note, Madam Speaker, that I received no answer from the Prime Minister. His reticence arouses suspicion and builds up more doubt in the minds of the Canadian public regarding the worthiness of this give-away program of CIDA to Communist Cuba. Why this policy of perfidy and deception? What is the affinity between Trudeau Liberal socialism and Communism?

Why is it so easy for Communist Cuba to obtain a \$10 million loan from Canadian taxpayers? We have no business lending money in this way to any country, especially Cuba. As a nation in its own sphere in the Caribbean, it is probably as well off as any, and better off than most Caribbean nations. It is rolling in sugar wealth because the price of sugar is high. It is well financed by Communist Russia. Moreover, it is a totalitarian state, and when dealing with a totalitarian regime, the spirit of charity toward the people is soon cooled and extinguished by the greed and totalitarian power of their dictators.

I know there are other Canadian trade pacts with Cuba which have nothing to do with CIDA, and these trade arrangements and other temporary loans connected with them are calculated to pay off for Canada. I hope and trust that they will, but this soft loan and give-away program ought not to be allowed. I call upon the Prime Minister to put a stop to it. There are people in our own country who need help but are not getting it. Our native people are dissatisfied. A great percentage of them are destitute, distracted and poor. How the government can give Canadian tax money to Communist Cuba on such easy terms I cannot understand. I, and millions of Canadians tonight, want to know the answer.

**Mr. Joseph-Philippe Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Madam Speaker, with reference to the alleged differences between statements by ministers on interest rates on a loan to Cuba, the statement by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) on February 20 that Cuba was not receiving CIDA loan funds bearing interest at 3 per cent was a simple statement of fact pertaining to the situation at that time.

On February 6, 1975, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) had approved a \$10 million loan by CIDA to Cuba at 3 per cent interest. This was the first time such a loan had been approved for Cuba. As of February 20, however, no funds had been disbursed against this loan.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—INCREASES IN COMMUTER  
FARES—REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PREVENT

**Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil):** Madam Speaker, the first thing I want to do is to correct the *Hansard* version of my question last Friday to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand), in both English and French. In the French translation the inclusion of les mots "le chemin de fer"

avant les mots "Canadien Pacifique" is necessary in order to distinguish between my question, which dealt with commuter fares, and the problem in the minister's mind having to do with increased air fares. My original question should have read:

Is the minister aware of the outcry that has followed the announcement by Canadian Pacific Railway yesterday of major increases in commuter fares from Montreal and is he prepared to intercede immediately to stop the May 1 implementation date for this exorbitant public transportation fare structure?

I would underline the words "major increases in commuter fares" which, by the admission of CP Rail, are of the order of 26 per cent.

Let me make it clear at the start that I am not contesting the statement by Canadian Pacific that the costs of providing the Montreal commuter services totalled \$5.6 million in 1974, that the revenues were \$3 million, and that the loss was \$2.6 million. Any discussion of the method of compilation of these figures is irrelevant to the main issue. The railway loses money. There are fewer trains than there were 25 years ago. The destination-to-destination time is longer; and many persons, myself included, maintain that trains are not as comfortable as they were. Few will dispute that there has been a deterioration in service.

The minister, in his response, spoke of a special appeal he was making to the airlines to exercise restraint, because some of the increases are really exaggerated and he does not believe the public can absorb those increases. We know that the airlines have been finding it hard this past year, but the problem of passenger rail traffic has been with us for many more years. The requests for increases in rail fares and the protests that follow come up with monotonous regularity.

I will now quote a paragraph from *Town Train News* of April, 1975. It says:

In 1970, the CTC began a comprehensive investigation into the revenues and costs of rail commuter service in Canada, to determine what assistance, if any, need be provided respecting commuter service operations. To date, the results of this investigation have not been made known.

The article goes on to say:

Montreal area commuter services have operated at a loss since shortly after World War Two.

CPR further goes on to maintain that, even with the suggested increases, the yield will be only enough to prevent an increase in 1975 of the amount of the loss sustained in 1974. According to *Town Train News* of April, 1975:

Losses are calculated according to the method used by the Canadian Transport Commission and thus exclude fixed costs and only allow for replacement of equipment at its original cost, rather than what it would cost today.

As CPR clearly points out:

Commuter services are not economically viable but they do provide certain social benefits beyond the value of revenues generated from the fares paid by the users themselves. There is therefore a legitimate need for financial support from public sources to ensure the viability of such services—

Urban transportation planning must examine important social and ecological aspects as well as technical and operational factors. Traffic congestion, pollution and fuel economy must form a growing part of any planning process.