

Mr. CREAGHAN: There is no doubt that the railway was there first and that you own the facts. But you brought in dieselization and you are speeding up your passenger trains all the time.

I think it would be only appropriate, seeing that it is a national company, that you adopt a different outlook and say: because we are putting on this type of equipment, we should be consistent, because our trains are now going faster all the time, and the municipalities are very hard up for funds, so perhaps we should bear a greater share of the cost.

Mr. GORDON: I think there is a great distortion being written into the record.

The Canadian National Railways has no objection whatsoever to protection at each and every crossing. Nothing would suit us better.

The only point is, that of the apportionment of cost.

A court has been set up by parliament known as the Board of Transport Commissioners which sits in judgment on each case. Every party having an interest appears before that court and it is the decision of the court which decides on what shall be a fair apportionment. We only put forward our views.

Mr. CREAGHAN: But the small or rural municipality cannot afford to send a solicitor to appear before the board.

Mr. GORDON: The Board of Transport Commissioners will take that into account. It is their judgment as to what is a fair apportionment.

Mr. HEES: If any member feels that any crossing is improperly guarded in his constituency or in any other constituency, he should go and see Mr. Sheppard and talk it over with him at the Board of Transport Commissioners. If he will go and explain his case to Mr. Sheppard, it is possible that he will get a better deal for a particular crossing where he thinks an injustice has been done.

Mr. GORDON: Or, if members of parliament should feel that the grade crossing fund should be administered on a different basis, then let them change the law and have it done, or make the government do it. You can increase that \$15 million if you want to, and the Board of Transport Commissioners could be given authority to bear 100 per cent of the cost if you so wished it.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a lot in what the president has said. Even before the election I have heard fellows promise to eliminate all level crossings. But following the election, with the long term objective and everything, in order to eliminate them it would only cost \$360 million to put in lights at all the 33,000 crossings. I have heard people talking about it for years.

Mr. CREAGHAN: I know of the case of a retired old lady who was killed in the centre of Moncton.

The CHAIRMAN: There was a fellow in my district who drove right through a gate at Allendale. He smashed the gate, and it cost him something, but he did not get killed. People will drive right through sometimes; and older people will go right through with their automobiles.

Mr. GORDON: I read that there were 76 deaths on the highway just over the week-end.

The CHAIRMAN: If we could get the Board of Transport Commissioners to eliminate all level crossings, I think it would bring better results. And as to having as many lights as possible, we have not to my mind made as comprehensive a job of it as it might be.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think the president has put his finger on the matter when he gave us the figures that in one year the expenditure amounted to about \$900,000.