

eye, Mr. Speaker. The CTC has produced a report on this subject. There is no doubt in my mind that one of the reasons for these accidents, and probably the main reason, is the failure of the railways to take proper care of the tracks. This is another way of showing a profit, another way of making money. In this case it is done at the expense of the welfare of Canadians and, sometimes, at the expense of lives.

The second point which the government should keep steadily in mind when considering a national transportation policy is that there must be an integrated national system. We can no longer talk about rail separately, or air transport separately, and so on. There must be an integrated system under which duplication is limited as far as possible, one which recognizes that the so-called competition is a sham. Who is competing with whom? The CN, as well as CP, now controls not only a railway but an air line, shipping, and trucking enterprises. The CP is already in the pipeline business and I gather from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) that the CN is also going into pipelines. They are into every form of transport in this country. So who are they competing with, except themselves?

**Mr. Peters:** And when necessary, they join hands.

**Mr. Lewis:** Yes. When necessary, they join hands. They agree on rates in many cases. It is meaningless to talk about competition. When one considers the present national transportation policy based on the false concept of profit-making, we realise, to use the words of Pierre Berton, that the national dream has, in this country, become a national nightmare, particularly for the Minister of Transport. And I sympathize with him, though I wish that he and his colleagues who preceded him had shown the wisdom to draw attention a great many years ago to the disastrous effects of the course upon which the government embarked in 1967.

It is in this context we propose that Canadian Pacific Limited be brought under public ownership. When I say this, I am talking not only about the rail operation, I am talking about the whole shebang—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lewis:** —the entire economic empire which they built as a result of Canadian grants. Everybody knows the history, and if they don't, they should. Everybody knows about the millions of dollars, the hundreds of millions in grants and subsidies which the Canadian people have given the CP, the millions of acres of land. As a result of these gifts from the Canadian people, CPR not only owns an airline, a shipping line, a trucking line and a telecommunications network, but a large complex in Trail and in other parts of British Columbia, Cominco, the Pine Point mine in the Northwest Territories, other properties all over the country through another subsidiary, and an oil company. Despite the earnings and the profits that these subsidiaries make, every time CPR is questioned about its railway, it says, "You cannot look at profits that we make anywhere else but only at the profits we make from the railway". My answer to Canadian Pacific is that they are making money out of other subsidiaries because the

### *National Transportation Policy*

Canadian people enabled them to build a railway, and those profits belong to the people of Canada.

● (1540)

I urge that we bring the CPR under public ownership. I say this not for doctrinaire reasons—though I will doubtless be accused of that—but because of my conviction that it is impossible to develop an integrated national transportation policy and let CPR remain in private hands. If CPR remains a private corporation concerned with making more and more profit, then it will continue in the future, as in the past, to sabotage—I do not use that word lightly but quite deliberately—every attempt to achieve a national transportation policy that seeks to serve the interests of Canada and not the profits of the CPR.

Fourth, I suggest that the government or an agency of the government, whether the CTC or some other body, must have the power to oversee and control investments of transportation companies so as to make sure they get sufficient rolling stock, take sufficient care of their roadbeds, and do all the other things that are necessary to maintain a decent and adequate transportation system.

Fifth, I urge that the government, or an agency of the government, must have real control over freight rates that serve national and regional interests and assist, rather than obstruct, the development of secondary industries in the parts of Canada that require them so badly.

Finally, I urge that the government should appoint immediately a freight controller, not only to meet the immediate emergency in regard to the movement of grain and other bulk commodities, but on a permanent basis to make sure that the railways provide the necessary rolling stock to meet the requirements of our import and export trade and needs of the Canadian people, rather than serve the interests of the CPR, or even the CNR.

There is no doubt that no other country in the world is so dependent on transportation as Canada. This is why we built the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is why we took over bankrupt railways and formed the Canadian National Railways. We realized the importance of a transportation system for the future wellbeing of Canada. The only policy that will serve the interest of Canadians for generations to come is an integrated policy that places all the major transportation systems under public ownership and control, a policy that is governed by those interests, not only national but also regional, that the Canadian people require to be met and fulfilled.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that I am not in an easy position, even if the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) made a long statement at first, that I believe to be a very honest one, saying that he agrees with the criticisms I made, but has grave doubts about whether I can follow up on them or revise them.

If I had not made these criticisms, I would obviously be accused of not having made them and of neglecting my duty. Anyway, I think that the rule of the game in Parliament as in court is that you should not try to prove yourself to the witnesses of your opponent. However, I do not hold this against him, because I find that I am not in