

present Leader, not the one who was retired in such an undignified manner. It is interesting to note the hypocrisy of the individuals in that Party who can say that the NDP put the previous Prime Minister out on the street. When that Prime Minister admitted he had made terrible mistakes, when that Prime Minister decided to take his Government and his colleagues to the people to ask for another mandate, that Party went right down the drain because the Canadian people had an opportunity to judge the merits of it. Now we have this tremendous hypocrisy when the Hon. Members of the Conservative Party can stand up in this House and say that the NDP did something nefarious in putting forward an amendment to a non-confidence motion which resulted in the fall of the Government, and later on those same Hon. Members turn around and turf that former Prime Minister right out of the leadership of their Party.

• (1930)

The incredibility of that proposition, Mr. Speaker, almost smacks of the "big lie" technique. Nevertheless, I expect those Hon. Members to preach it, to attempt to preach it, but there are a lot of people in Canada who believe that the Conservative Party and its masters in central Canada, on Bay Street, are the ones who have in fact done it to another westerner. That Party did it to the former Hon. Member for Prince Albert and now it has done it to the former Prime Minister of Canada. It is just not acceptable to that Party to have a westerner in control of the situation. Therefore, I would not want to hear another Hon. Member stand up during this Crow debate to say that the Conservative Party had any intention of doing anything to repair the railroad system in Canada. That Party needs to work pretty well full time just trying to keep its caucus together on the same track.

The other incredible message which that Party has been trying to deliver in this House, that in some way turfing out the former Conservative Government was anything less than a service to the Canadian people, is astounding. It has also been interesting to listen to the former Conservative speaker who felt that the Canadian Pacific Railway had done a great service to Canada. He spoke of John A. Macdonald. It is interesting to note that John A. Macdonald did not lead the Conservative Party. He led an organization which was called the Liberal-Conservative Party. There is no doubt about the common interest of both Parties which John A. Macdonald represented in the House in selling out the Canadian people.

The Canadian Pacific Railway did not do a service for this country. The people who built that railroad, who poured their savings into it, who had some trust in the Government at the time, feel that they have been betrayed. Canadians, except possibly for the small covey of compatriots here who cannot see beyond their own noses on these issues, feel they have been betrayed. The Canadian Pacific Railway, in concert with the Liberal-Conservative Party, led by John A. Macdonald and the Bank of Montreal, skimmed Canada of 25 million acres of land, \$25 million, a handout so incredibly rich that anyone to whom that was given would owe a duty and an obligation to this country to conduct the services which they had guaranteed to provide for time immemorial, virtually. Either that, or they

should turn back the resources which they were given, turn back the benefits which those resources have gained for them over the period of years. That is a fair offer, Mr. Speaker. We may be able to assume the burden of the taxpayers if in fact that corporation is prepared to do that.

A second item which is under consideration, and it has been mentioned before, is that there is something very obscene in placing a burden, a renewed burden on the taxpayers, and a very heavy burden on western farmers, in order to bail out two railroad systems in Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways. These companies are currently investing offshore, taking funds which they have earned in Canada, and instead of investing that capital in the upgrading of the railway system, instead of investing it in hopper cars and all the station improvements and equipment, they are taking it outside the country. From the point of view of the merchant shipping issue, in which I know the Conservative Party is interested, I cannot really help but wonder about the Canadian Pacific ships and how it can buy those ships offshore with Canadian dollars, how it can operate those ships without Canadian crews, and bank the money in Bermuda. It is astounding. It does not pay tax here. It provides no benefit here. In fact, it deprives Canadians of economic opportunity and, indeed, of employment. That is the kind of thing which the Conservative Party stands for, the old allies of the CPR. That is what the previous speaker from the Conservative Party was praising.

One of the most astounding advertisements for the Canadian Pacific Railway which I have ever seen was the one it released during the period of the Grey Cup. It announced the tremendous speed of a ship called the *Beaverford*, which fought off a German vessel during the Second World War. At that point in time, Mr. Speaker, it claimed that it was building for a new Canada. Yet the tradition of the CP ships—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. MacLaren): Order, please. I regret to inform the Hon. Member that his time has expired.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my colleagues would be interested, especially my Conservative colleagues here tonight, in hearing a little more?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. MacLaren): The Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) has the floor.

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I hear the Liberals over there saying, "Tell me something about metric". Well, we would not be in the mess we are in with metric if it had not been for the help of the New Democratic Party in supporting the Liberal Government in bringing about a change to metric—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. MacLaren): Order.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, a small reminder. The Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) just asked for permission to extend the time for him to continue his remarks. It seems to me the Chair should ask the House if there is unanimous consent for him to do so.