

Transportation

opposition for pushing everything through the house too hastily.

Mr. Churchill: I find myself co-operating now with the Minister of Finance. I am glad that he does not agree with the Minister of Transport. The Minister of Finance wants this bill to be considered very carefully. I suggest to my colleagues that they should take note of that fact and make preparations to speak tomorrow on this bill, in order to accommodate both ministers.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if I could ask the hon. gentleman a question? He was flattering enough to quote my reference to a relatively brief general debate on second reading, perhaps unwisely observing things in retrospect. Would he be kind enough to quote the last part of that same paragraph on page 7998 of *Hansard*?

Mr. Churchill: I have never found that putting the minister's words in speeches of mine does any good at all, and I do not know why I should give him additional publicity by repeating some of his badly phrased sentences. I think I will just leave it there, for everybody to read. He has drawn attention to the fact that he made that remark on September 1, 1966, at page 7998. I record that in *Hansard* for the edification of the next generation of parliamentarians.

I want to comment on some other matters that the minister mentioned, before dealing with certain general aspects of the bill. As I say, I realize the damage I am doing to my speech by quoting the minister's words, but I want to be fair to him. At page 7991 of *Hansard*, in the second column, when he is dealing with the very large board that he is setting up, he uses these words:

I have reached the conclusion that one of the most important things of all is to have one unified organ of government divorced from any of these different modes of transport which would look at all of them, compare one with another and, when considering the regulation of one, would take account of what was happening in the other fields.

And so on.

Now the minister has been affected by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) and he wants to put everything together. I am surprised he did not use the word "integration". He has got the word "unified" in, anyway. He wants to unify, and so he set up a board. He has integrated three boards. He has put them together and added four members, one of whom will be the head. He is

appointing a czar, and he is going to have an organization similar to that of the Minister of National Defence, with a chief of staff under the minister.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I am sorry he has been infected by this desire to unify everything. The Minister of Transport did not tell us, though he is much more frank about these matters than is the Minister of National Defence why the system now proposed will be better than the present arrangement. There may be some value attached to integrating various boards. The strange thing I noticed when I looked over the bill was this, that having integrated the boards, the hon. gentleman then separated them again. They are to carry on their present functions and, from time to time—it is not very clear as to when this will happen—they are to assemble together and compare notes. So we will have a body of experts on maritime affairs, and a body of experts on railway freight rates, and a body of experts on air transport trying to have a meeting of minds. I do not think this is likely to work at all. I believe we are better off under the present arrangement whereby these specialists advise the minister. He can call them together and say: Gentlemen, our national policy is such and such; in your particular field you do not meet requirements of these other boards and I wish to reach a consensus here and arrive at a modification of policy.

This, I would think, is the function of a Minister of Transport. It is for this that the minister exists. But the hon. gentleman has delegated that authority to a very large board and put a man at the head of it who will have tremendous powers. That is his excursion into unification.

I wish to comment now, on something else which I think should be corrected in the minister's thinking and in subsequent speeches he makes. The following appears on page 7991 of *Hansard*. I will quote most of the paragraph—this will really please the hon. gentleman:

I do not think anything illustrates this more clearly than what has happened in the seven years since 1959. In those seven years, on three occasions, however this may have been disguised, the greater part of the increased wage bill of the Canadian railways has been passed on to the taxpayers of Canada—\$20 million in 1959, \$50 million in 1961 and another \$20 million in 1966.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is a misprint. I thank the hon. gentleman for drawing attention to it. It should be \$30 million. He will find that