

*Supply—Transport*

problem could be handled. It seems to me there are many forms of agreement that could be entered into, any of which, of course, would have its problems. The scheme could be operated completely by the metropolitan corporation. To do this they could use the right-of-way on a rental basis. They could either construct rail lines on the present right-of-way or they could make arrangements to integrate with the present services and rent the existing rail lines. The rights of way are the key to the situation. Under such a suggestion the Toronto Transportation Commission could operate the necessary rolling stock. However, I doubt that that would be too palatable to the Canadian National Railways, or Canadian Pacific Railway, who are accustomed to running their own show and perhaps would find it impossible to consider such a method of operation. Therefore, let us consider operation by the railways. This could be done by sharing whatever deficit was incurred. There would have to be a very careful accounting of costs and very careful negotiation as to how the deficit, if any, was to be apportioned among the various parties concerned.

On the other hand, you could take the cost of operating such a system and work out the rates of fare required to underwrite the cost completely, and then the metropolitan corporation could, to the point it felt necessary, subsidize that cost. This seems to me to be the most practicable manner of handling the problem. The rates could be kept at that point at which the commuter could afford to pay. We could keep a careful cost accounting system of the operation of this particular part of the railways operation, and in that way the metropolitan corporation would be protected. It may balk at such a scheme, saying, "We would not have any control over the costs concerned", and they would also no doubt say, "Here we are entering into a continuing expense; we do not know how far it is going to go or how long it is going to last". But all transport is a continuing expense. I cannot think of anything more costly to our municipal corporation than the provision of all these roads, arterial highways, bridges, etc., they have had to build. Consideration of this type of transportation would be very worth while indeed from their point of view.

There is a corollary to such a system which perhaps I am out of order in mentioning in this debate, but I should just point out that in matters of civil defence it would be most useful. Compare the rapid, customary and controlled evacuation of thousands of people, by a system such as I have suggested, with a situation where the same thousands of people are all trying to get on to a series of highways with no control, all at the same

[Mr. Enfield.]

time. The customary feature is the important part when you are thinking along these lines, because this is an evacuation that would occur every day and could be carried out in an orderly and completely controlled fashion. The effects on civil defence would be very salutary indeed.

I do not know what the minister's thinking is on this particular subject, or if he has ever had occasion to canvass the idea. It would take a co-operative effort on a shared cost basis, and possibly it may embody a new concept for the railways. I will just conclude by urging the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway to keep an open mind on the subject. I would urge the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. to search constantly for and do research on cheaper methods of handling this type of commuter service for, of course, if such methods could be found and commuter service put on a profitable basis there would be no problem whatsoever. It would simply be a matter of growth and increase in the rolling stock of the facilities concerned. If the minister does have any words of encouragement or information on the matter I would, of course, be most happy to have the benefit of his thoughts and ideas. As I say, it is a very live issue in metropolitan Toronto and the issue will arise again and again in all our metropolitan areas in Canada because this problem of transporting people in and out of cities is with us and with us to stay.

(Translation):

**Mr. Balcer:** My remarks in this debate, Mr. Chairman, will be limited to a matter which is of particular interest to my constituents in Three Rivers as well as to the people of the surrounding district which is served through the port of that city.

This afternoon I would like to bring to the attention of the house the fantastic niggardliness of the national harbours board with regard to our port, as well as its obstinate refusal to carry out the improvements made urgently necessary by the St. Lawrence seaway project.

In a few months, this country will begin to reap benefits from the St. Lawrence seaway project. We, the people of Three Rivers and the surrounding district, are anxious to see our harbour receive its share of those benefits.

For this purpose, Mr. Chairman, the port of Three Rivers must be altered altogether and be provided for in the budget of the national harbours board.

The chairman of the St. Lawrence seaway authority, Hon. Lionel Chevrier, stated recently in Copenhagen that the seaway