

*Supply—Transport*

report of the Canadian National Railways, where I find this statement on page 7:

There were fewer passengers in 1955 than in the previous year. The number of intercity passengers was up slightly, despite a reduction in immigrant and military travel, but this was more than offset by a drop in the number of commuters—

I should like to digress for a moment to say that in that central area between Toronto and Montreal live many people who work in Kingston. They live in Brockville or Belleville and travel back and forth night and day. A modern service would facilitate their getting to work and would relieve traffic on the highways which are overtaxed at the moment.

The report goes on to say:

—largely the outcome of modifications to suburban service authorized during the year. The increase in patronage of intercity passenger trains was in part a sign of generally more buoyant business conditions. It was also in part a measure of the company's endeavours to stimulate rail travel—new standards of passenger accommodation and meal service, faster intercity and transcontinental train schedules, all-inclusive package tours and incentive fares for midweek excursions and family trips.

I can see from the statistics of the railway that the Canadian National Railways, particularly, in their passenger services, depend a great deal upon the commuters. I believe that the commuter service has not been fully developed, though it has a good possibility of being developed. When we consider that our railways are of such value to passengers and that there were fewer passengers last year than in the previous year, while at the same time we had more population in this country and a greater national growth, we must also consider the other side of the picture, how these passengers are travelling.

One of the best examples would be the bus lines in certain areas, and particularly in those areas in competition with the railways. The bus lines have been running a service that begins when you step into the terminal and continues until you step off at another terminal. My remarks might indicate that there should be a little salesmanship on behalf of the railways, but I feel that when you go into the bus terminal, of which several have been constructed between Toronto and Montreal, you generally find a modern terminal. It is not only attractive to the eye but comfortable for the passengers using the buses. The officers in charge have sufficient space to carry on their duties. There is a good baggage room. There are waiting rooms in some cases that are excelled only by high-priced restaurants. The washrooms are modern and comply with very strict health regulations.

On the other side of the picture, if we turn to page 11 of the report of the Canadian

National Railways for 1955, we find under the heading "Property and Service Improvements"—where I presume stations would be dealt with—it states:

In 1955, as in other recent years, substantial capital expenditures were made to improve the railway's equipment and facilities in order to provide better service at lower cost. Much of this investment is based not merely on considerations of immediate return but also on the management's duty to provide a sound foundation for growth. The full benefits of expenditures made under this broader criterion will be realized only over a period of years extending far into the future.

Sometimes it is a good idea to provide better service at lower cost. That might be done in dealing with certain phases of the business. At the same time—again I am particularly referring to this area between Toronto and Montreal where train travel has a preference—you can get a sleeper on the train and have your meals on the train, which some people prefer to travelling on the buses and stopping at terminals. In any case the services in competition with the railways are continually attracting more passengers, from among the public of Canada, as they did a few years ago in regard to freight. This tendency will probably continue because, among other things, the people will be attracted by the terminals, which are not only attractive to the eye but also cater to their comfort. Therefore I suggest that under this item of capital expenditure there should also be added improvements to stations and station facilities, and particularly improvements to those facilities in areas where there is a great travel potential.

In this area between Toronto and Montreal, outside of the two metropolitan cities, I do not think there is any station to be proud of. In most instances they are not exactly attractive and their services are inadequate. I would refer particularly to the Kingston station. This has been talked about by politicians and other authorities for a period of over 30 years, but so far very little has been done. During the war an addition was constructed to the west of the station to take care of the increased passenger services during that period, when so many soldiers were located in the Kingston area. This part of the building is in very bad condition. As a matter of fact, the other day there was a hole in the centre of the hardwood floor that you could put your foot through; and this was at a time when people were asked to pass through it. The waiting room is about as uncomfortable as any waiting room could be.

I have had a good deal of experience in going to police stations and interviewing clients who are held in custody, and I must say that their waiting rooms are much more