

*Railway Act*

years from now. If I could sit down right now and pass this thing I would do so.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Sit down, sit down.

**Mr. Bigg:** I should think my hon. friends to my left would like to hear at least this part of my address. It is urgent; it is necessary, and paragraph (d) of our amendment is an effort to say, regardless of party, regardless of class, regardless of personal income or lack of it, that we need action and need it now. This is one of the things we cannot delay any longer. Our people, even in the great province of Alberta, are not all getting it, and I think they should get it as a matter of right.

I do not think this is socialistic. This is a debt we owe. It is a debt to the people who pioneered this country, who have earned a right to have their broken, tired old bodies looked after for the remaining few years of their lives. How can I do otherwise than support this amendment in all four of its phases?

Before I sit down I want to reiterate that I believe in medical care. But that does not necessarily mean medicare, which is beginning to have a bad smell, so far as I am concerned, because it means some kind of state-imposed strait-jacket on the individual, on the doctor, on the province, and perhaps on the whole economy. I am willing to accept the principle of looking after our old people. I am even willing to accept what looks like socialism, or anything else you want to call it, so long as we can give our people social justice, something which we can well afford and which we have no excuse for delaying one more day.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to consideration of private members business as listed on today's order paper, namely public bills and private bills.

**RAILWAY ACT****REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION COMPANY REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEE**

**Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond)** moved the second reading of Bill No. C-18, to amend the Railway Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, earlier this week a private member's bill was introduced which was very timely. I refer to Bill No. C-234, to amend the Criminal Code by providing for the elimination of premium stamps in food establishments, and which was introduced by the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Klein). If there were any inclination to proceed with

[Mr. Bigg.]

that bill I would be quite happy to yield my place because of the importance of the subject. However, as the hon. member is not here I would like to give him notice that we in this party will be willing to yield our place any other Friday that private members bills come up for discussion, because his is one of great concern at the present time, due to high prices.

Bill No. C-18 is the same as Bill No. C-55 which I introduced in 1964 and which was debated on September 18, 1964. To explain the purposes of the bill I shall simply quote a few sentences from what I said on that previous occasion, as recorded at page 8221 of *Hansard* for 1964:

This is an act to amend the Railway Act by requiring transportation companies operating under the Railway Act to file a copy of their reports with the House of Commons. My idea is that such reports should be referred to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines where they could be examined.

I went on to say that officials of the companies in question could be summoned before the committee where they could be examined by its members, as is done in the case of the Canadian National Railways. The purpose is still the same, Mr. Speaker, to have the companies in question, companies operating under the Railway Act, file returns with the House of Commons. These companies already file returns with the Board of Transport Commissioners and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. My idea would be to have similar returns filed here and referred for examination to what we now call the transportation committee.

Government members who participated in the debate in 1964 spent a great deal of their time defending private enterprise and denouncing socialism. According to some of their remarks it appeared as though I were introducing a bill to nationalize the Canadian Pacific Railway. That may be a good idea in itself, but it is not the purpose of the bill and I feel their remarks were largely irrelevant. The purpose is simply to get officials of the railway companies—and I admit I have the C.P.R. particularly in mind—before a committee for questioning.

As we all know, the Canadian National Company officials appear each year, including the president, the vice presidents and all members of senior management. They are available to be questioned by members of the house. The C.N. is an organization that affects just about every community in Canada, and it is a good democratic practice that the