

CNR and Air Canada

become a little worried when they tend to stray away from the subject, because then they become more dangerous political foes. However, I was pleased to hear him answer my question. When he spoke about taking over the CPR I asked him, what about the smelters? He said we should nationalize them also. I was pleased to have that answer put on the record because it shows how strong the waffle movement within that party is. Although quite often they profess to have no wafflers in the House of Commons—they are all straight NDP-ers, none of them really follow the Laxer doctrine—here we find one who is pretty close to being a full-blooded waffler. I always like to hear socialists speak about socialism because one knows what they are thinking, but when they get away from the subject, perhaps they become more dangerous.

Section 1 of the National Transportation Act reads:

It is hereby declared that an economic, efficient and adequate transportation system making the best use of all available modes of transportation at the lowest total cost is essential to protect the interests of the users of transportation and to maintain the economic wellbeing and growth of Canada, and that these objectives are most likely to be achieved when all modes of transport are able to compete under conditions ensuring that having due regard to national policy and to legal and constitutional requirements—

• (1700)

Many people have attempted from time to time to find out what the Liberal party's national policy is with respect to transportation. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) did not say anything about it in his speech in the Throne Speech debate. But looking over that paragraph, I will remember the fight that we had to add the word "adequate". There was a heated debate in the Transport Committee, but we finally got agreement on the words, "an economic, efficient, and adequate transportation system" is needed in Canada.

That is really what the debate is all about today. Is the present system adequate? We can all question whether it is efficient, and whether it is to be efficient in the interests of revenue or in the interests of the people? But is it adequate to serve Canada? Without a doubt the hon. member from Newfoundland who spoke this afternoon said it was not adequate in his province. He said they needed a wide gauge railway there. From my experience of travelling in Newfoundland, I certainly believe they need the track straightened out. There are 500 miles of track across the province. It winds around every little hill and every little swamp. If the shortest distance between two points is a straight line, then it is the furthest thing from a straight line. Therefore, it is difficult to serve the people of that province adequately. I agree with the hon. member that The "Bullet" could have been made an attractive tourist promotion. Certainly, tourism is one of Canada's biggest industries. It is disappointing that the Minister of Transport, who comes from Newfoundland, neglects that province so badly in transportation matters.

What is the situation in western Canada? A lot of members have visited Vancouver. In the latter part of February I, too, made a trip to Vancouver to find out why our grain was not moving as efficiently as it should have been. I can honestly say that I found the system inadequate. We were about a month behind in grain deliveries to Vancouver. There were about 25 ships waiting in the harbour, with only about 8 million to 10 million bushels of grain in

[Mr. Horner.]

the terminals. Another 20 million bushels were needed. I was told it was on the tracks on its way to Vancouver. One can pick up any newspaper and see these facts reported. Here is one. The *Manitoba Co-operator* of March 2 has an article headed, "Grain Loading Catastrophic at Vancouver."

There has been much talk to the effect that because of the Crowsnest Pass rates, railways don't want to move grain since they do not make any money moving it. Recently, Mr. Speaker, the CPR wanted to move coal to Roberts Bank from three points in British Columbia, for the Kaiser Coal Company. In order to stop the contract from going to an American line south of the border, the CPR had to set a rate which in effect is lower than the Crowsnest Pass rates. The rate set is \$3.69 per ton. For moving grain, even from Alberta, the CPR and the CNR receive a higher return under the Crowsnest Pass rates.

The Crowsnest Pass rates cannot solely be blamed for the delay in moving grain. Some hon. members say that if the railways got more money they would look after the business better. Mr. Speaker, railways charge an awful lot of money for moving cattle from western Canada to eastern Canada. But last fall we heard all kinds of complaints about the manner in which the railways treated that trade. In some cases in my constituency boxcars, loaded with cattle, sat on the tracks for almost 24 hours before a train came along to pick them up. It was no wonder that when they reached eastern Canada it was found that as many as 20 to 30 calves had died in the cars. No other form of transport can move bulk traffic over great land distances. The railways know this. Grain has to sit on the prairies waiting for them to move it. In effect, they move everything else first, and finally move the grain.

The whole railroad complex has to be changed. The National Transportation Act did not inject any new spirit of service into the railroad business. Section 3 of that Act reads:

—each mode of transport, so far as practicable, carries traffic to or from any point in Canada under tolls and conditions that do not constitute

- (i) an unfair disadvantage in respect of any such traffic—
- (ii) an undue obstacle to the interchange of commodities between points in Canada or unreasonable discouragement to the development of primary or secondary industries or to export trade in or from any region of Canada or to the movement of commodities through Canadian ports:

The railroads have not lived up to that. I doubt very much whether the Canadian Transport Commission is trying to encourage the railroads to live up to it. When you appoint a board to look after the railroads it may immediately become the servant of the railroads. That is the danger in appointing boards and not making them responsible to the elected representatives of the people. The railroads have certainly not tried to provide an adequate transportation system. Through their freight rates, they have created undue obstacles to the interchange of commodities between points in Canada. They have discouraged the development of primary and secondary industry.

I wish the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Harries) were present, Mr. Speaker. He made a big speech in Calgary on this very subject. He is never in this House, but he seems to attract some press from time to time. I do