

thing. I know the same thing has happened in his riding as well. The railways are more interested in the railways than they are in the public good.

When it comes to this motion today, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is probably very relevant to look at the tremendous power of the CPR because it is one of the most powerful companies in this country. When we are looking at this amendment we must realize and point out to the Government that it is necessary to give the Administrator this power because on the other side of the table sits a very powerful corporation, one of the most powerful corporations in our country.

An Hon. Member: In the world.

Mr. Nystrom: In the world, I suppose. This corporation is not just involved in railroading with Canadian Pacific Limited as the chief company. It is also involved in all kinds of other businesses as well, including hotels, mining, transportation and shipping. I would just like to mention to you, Mr. Speaker, and particularly to Government Members, some of the subsidiaries of the CPR, which I think will point out to you why it is such a powerful company and why it is so important that Motion No. 33 be carried by this House. This amendment would give farmers, through their Transportation Committee, a little more power in dealing with the CPR.

Canadian Pacific Limited is a company which controls a number of the following companies: Canadian Pacific Investments, CPR, CP Air, Cascade Pipelines, CP Telecommunications, CP Bermuda, CP Shipping, Smith Transport, CP Transport, CP Express and CP Rail. That, Mr. Speaker, gives you an idea of the tremendous corporate power which the CPR has. It gives you an idea—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. I suspect that the Chair is going to have a difficult time this morning in attempting to convince Hon. Members that their remarks must be relevant. In examining the specific clause which the amendment seeks to change—I do hope my remarks are not interpreted as the Chair wanting to participate in the debate—I cannot see the connection between the powers of the Administrator and control over subsidiaries and what have you. I would invite the Hon. Member, if there is a link, to demonstrate it as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Nystrom: I am referring, Mr. Speaker, with respect and deference, to Motion No. 33 which the Hon. Member for Vegreville has submitted. It is a motion which would give the Administrator the real power to control the CPR, to direct the CNR, to allocate boxcars and make all kinds of arrangements which would be of benefit to the farmers.

● (1140)

Clause 17(d) would read that the Minister has the power to:—promote, and shall require, if necessary, reciprocal and other arrangements—

What the Hon. Member for Vegreville wants to do is to require them, if necessary, to make reciprocal and other arrangements. He wants the word “require” to be inserted

Western Grain Transportation Act

because that would give the Administrator the power to control the CPR and CNR regarding arranging the cars on the various lines.

We have a very good example of this in my riding. The Port of Churchill is very important and there is a CN line which goes there and often there is grain on CP lines, which are not that far away, which should be going to the Port of Churchill and is not because we do not necessarily have the power to direct the CPR. For your information, Mr. Speaker, I was putting on the record a little bit of evidence which shows the House how very powerful the CPR is. It is an extremely big and powerful company but I will not list all the subsidiaries because there are 45 or 50, or perhaps even more. That shows you there is absolutely immense power resting in the hands of the CPR. I will respect what you said and not go into it any further.

Another point is that over the years we have tended to subsidize massively the CPR. We have used your tax money, Mr. Speaker, the tax money of your parents, friends, indeed the friends of everyone in this House, to subsidize massively the CPR. In return we have basically said to them that they do what they think is best, run the railway the way they want to without regard to what is happening to the services for Canadians. In fact, often the CPR profits are about the same as the taxpayers' subsidy.

To show you the power these boys have, Mr. Speaker, in 1967 the total federal subsidy to the CPR was \$45 million and the CPR profit was some \$33 million. In 1968—that is the first year both you and I were here, Mr. Speaker—this House voted them subsidies of some \$40 million. Do you know what their profit was? It was \$43 million in 1968. I am sure that if you were aware of that, Mr. Speaker, we would not have done the same thing in 1969. But in that year we again voted the CPR a subsidy of \$35 million and its profits were \$31.4 million.

I can go beyond that. I can go right to 1981 or 1982 and show you how we have given blank cheques to the CPR and it has spent the money virtually as it saw fit. There are many other models which could be followed. We had a very distinguished freelance—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but his time has expired.

Some Hon. Members: Continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Is the Hon. Member seeking to have his time extended?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Is there unanimous consent—

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I regret that there is not unanimous consent.