

are still considerable. During this period, under the preferred stock arrangement referred to in the Capital Revision Act of 1952, I calculate that besides what we voted in the Estimates for annual deficits, \$305 million has been spent in buying stock upon which we get no interest. I think this should be taken into consideration.

In addition to that, and in keeping with the custom for quite a number of years, the bill requests that we waive interest on \$100 million of debt referred to in the 1952 bill. It was intended that after 10 years that interest would be paid. As I think I mentioned earlier, each year Parliament has been asked to agree that the national railway system be relieved of any obligation to pay interest on this sum of money.

I estimate, not from the original time of the capital revision but for the period 1954-65—and I am taking annual periods—that in addition to what I have already stated, deficits have totalled \$452 million. These expenditures may be in the national interest, but I think they should be looked into. In four years there were surpluses: In 1952 and 1953 they were insignificant; 1955, a rather large surplus of \$10.7 million; and in 1956, \$26 million. But, apart from that, in addition to the purchase of this preferred stock which has seldom returned any interest, there have been deficits which I calculate total these considerable sums mentioned.

As I see it, these are the matters that should be taken into account in considering the second reading of this bill. I would not for a moment feel competent to answer detailed questions about the operations of a corporation as huge as this one, but I suggest to my colleagues in the Senate that in as much as even their capital budgets for 1965 and 1966 have not been examined by a committee of the other place—for good reasons, which I accept—it would be a worthwhile exercise on the part of this chamber to review these budgets and those expenditures.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Honourable senators, I should like to ask the sponsor of this bill (Hon. Mr. Benidickson) a question, but before doing so may I compliment him upon the excellent, clear and businesslike way in which he presented these complicated figures. I should like to ask if I am correct in understanding that we are only now appointing auditors for the years 1965 and 1966; that during those years there have been no auditors in charge.

Hon. Mr. Benidickson: Honourable senators, that is a very valid question, and it is one that concerned me when I was considering this bill. I think the act of 1964 authorized the appointment of auditors to the end of 1965. I told you that there was a two-year bill for 1962 and 1963, and then a bill in 1964, but the authority of the 1964 act would extend only to the end of 1965. I must say that I find that for the 1966 calendar year the auditors have been on the job, but they have been on the job with the feeling that Parliament would pass this legislation.

Honourable senators, in fairness to the other place I want to point out that this bill came before them in June or July of 1966, but you must remember that although the committee worked hard on its reference it was, first of all, dealing with the passenger service of the C.P.R., and then it had to work hard on and think about the omnibus bill with respect to transport resulting from the MacPherson Royal Commission, which had been held up for about four years. The other place did not deal with the annual affairs of the C.N.R. in 1966.

Hon. Walter M. Aseltine: Honourable senators, I always like to be present in the chamber when the senator from Kenora-Rainy River (Hon. Mr. Benidickson) makes a speech, because generally he has something to say and he says it very well. However, when I heard that he was to move the second reading of this bill I wondered what he would say about it in view of the fact that there was almost no debate on it in the other place.

As Senator Benidickson intimated, the resolution was moved in the other place on June 27, 1966. It was concurred in on July 14, 1966, without any debate whatever, and the bill was then read the first time. The only thing done on first reading was that the sponsor made a brief statement which takes up ten lines in the *Hansard* of the other place.

The second reading of the bill was not moved in the other place until December 6, 1966, and on that motion there was but a very brief debate. There were only one or two speakers and, to my knowledge, none of the matters that have been discussed by the honourable sponsor in this chamber were brought up. The bill was then referred to the committee of the whole house where it was debated briefly, and was finally read the third time and passed without any further debate to speak of.