

Railways and Shipping Committee

the air transport board to proceed to hold hearings, notwithstanding the provisions of section 15 (2) which indicate that in this kind of transcontinental operation it is not the air transport board but the governor in council who, in the final analysis, must hear the application and determine upon it.

Mr. Hees: May I answer that question now, Mr. Speaker? The purpose of the Wheatcroft report is to be a guide to the air transport board in the examination of applications made to it. As the hon. member for Laurier has said, and quite rightly, these decisions are decisions of the government made on the recommendations of the air transport board. This is true with respect to a licence of any kind, but as the hon. member knows very well, the decision is the decision of the government and the recommendation comes to it from the air transport board.

Mr. Chevrier: The point I was making was that we had no information to that effect. I think the minister owes it to the house to tell us what is the position. It was for that reason I was putting on the record those three positions that seem to me to be incongruous and to be contradictory. The minister has made a short interjection which gives the house some idea of what his intention is, but I think he should go much further when he has the opportunity later to enter this debate.

I have touched on a good many subjects relating to transportation in Canada and particularly these three government enterprises, the Canadian National Railways, Canadian National Steamships and Trans-Canada Air Lines. I should like now to conclude my remarks by asking the minister when he replies to tell us something about the Pine Point railway. It seems to me the government has maintained a very discreet silence with reference to that railway. The speech from the throne contained a statement to the effect that the railway would be built. Since there are many aspects of the question upon which information ought to be given to the house, I feel that during the discussion of this motion additional information should be provided in connection with the railway to Great Slave lake. In a word, we would like to be brought up to date on what the government and the Canadian National Railways are doing in regard to this important project.

I should have liked to take advantage of this occasion to say something further about the expansion of transportation facilities in Canada, the expansion of the facilities of Canadian National Railways while the government of which I was a member was in office, because I believe that what was done by the former administration with reference

[Mr. Chevrier.]

to transportation facilities, railway facilities, air facilities, is something that should be put on the record. Unfortunately I have not the time today, nor would I take advantage of the good humour of the house, to do that on this occasion. But I do hope to be able to indicate at some future time the glorious record of the Liberal administration in the field of transportation.

We believe, sir, that upon this motion we should put on record some of the feelings we have with regard to these government-owned enterprises. We believe, too, that this committee should be established in order to give an opportunity to the officers of Canadian National Railways, and of other government-owned enterprises, to submit their accounts and their respective annual reports. That is the purpose of the committee, during the sittings of which examination of the officers of these government enterprises will take place.

So, Mr. Speaker, because we believe not only in the utility of the discussion of this motion but also in the usefulness of the committee, we shall without the slightest hesitation warmly support the adoption of this motion.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): In rising to indicate the thoughts of the C.C.F. in relation to this motion I should like to say at the outset, after listening to the hon. member for Laurier, that I am sure many hon. members could dispense with ghost writers in the preparation of their remarks and merely review past issues of *Hansard*, as he has done in making his remarks concerning this particular motion. We remember the glorious record of the Liberal party, also, when it comes to the operation of Canadian National Railways and Canadian National Steamships.

Especially do the people in Prince Rupert remember the brutal and blunt way in which they allowed that company's shipyard to be removed in bits and pieces from Prince Rupert, thus removing one of the last possible hopes of expansion of the shipbuilding industry in the northern part of British Columbia or in the north coastal region. If that is part of the glorious record of the Liberal party, I would imagine it is one of the parts that he and other members of his party would like to forget.

But in any event there is one matter, Mr. Speaker, or one policy that is being shown here that I think is a most unwise one for the Minister of Transport (Mr. Hees) to follow. I might say he is not alone in using this approach. Along with him are other members of the cabinet, notably the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Green) who a few days ago had somewhat the same approach. But if the