

of their mining or gas companies in western Canada, they would expect the people on the other side who signed to stick to their bargain. We expect the railways to stick to their end of the bargain with us. This does not mean that we will not discuss a more economic way of providing passenger service. Of course, we will. As legislators we want to do things as economically as humanly possible. But we want to see the people provided with transportation, particularly in areas where there is no bus service or air service. Passenger trains can provide service, and we must interfere with the decision of the CTC on this matter.

I respect the judgment of these gentlemen. A hundred years from now it may be proven that they were right. But at this point in time the people of Canada, particularly those with whom we talked last week in western Ontario, disagree with these gentlemen of the CTC. It costs us a great deal of money to provide passenger service to the people of Canada through our railway systems. But we spend large sums of money on many other causes. The CBC is frequently criticized for its large annual deficits. But the CBC is used to provide television and radio service in both languages to remote parts of Canada. Under no circumstances could such service to the Northwest Territories, the Yukon and the northern parts of the provinces make money. We have accepted the fact that all our citizens deserve this service.

In the same way I have no doubt in the world that the western farmers deserve the 2,000 extra grain cars that are being provided for them through the Canadian Wheat Board at a cost of \$42 million, even though I have not yet been told about the financial arrangements. This is a necessary service. I would be the last to criticize it, but I point out that we in western Ontario also deserve something. Factually, Mr. Speaker, 40 per cent of the taxes of all Canada come out of the province of Ontario. One of things we deserve in return is a passenger service, if not by rail at least by bus, or by some other method, provided as efficiently and economically as possible under the dictates of this Parliament and this government. This is something we have not got.

The last part of the sentence I quoted from our national transportation policy read, "it is essential to protect the interests of the users of transportation and to maintain the economic well-being and growth of Canada." It is absolutely impossible to promote the economic growth and well-being of Canadians in western Ontario if we do not have adequate transportation facilities. For this reason I think the hon. member who presented this motion this afternoon was on the right track.

**Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that today is an opportune time to have this debate in the House of Commons following the hearings we held in western Ontario last week on the inadequacy of rail passenger service and bus service, as mentioned by the previous speaker. Yesterday in the House a motion was moved under Standing Order 43 by the hon. member for Wellington-Gray-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Howe) that alluded to the lack of passenger service, to the hearings that were held last week throughout western Ontario, and to the fact that adequate bus service has not replaced the rail

### *National Transportation Policy*

passenger service that was discontinued in 1970. That motion, which I seconded, reads:

• (1720)

That the government immediately issue instructions to the Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific Railway to re-establish the passenger rail services which were discontinued in November, 1970, in western Ontario.

Federal authorities in conjunction with the province of Ontario and the municipalities involved immediately undertake studies which would involve public hearings with a view to determining a minimum railway passenger train network as defined in relationship to the most economic, efficient and adequate transportation system required.

That motion was turned down by the government, Mr. Speaker, and I might suggest in all kindness to the hon. member who just finished speaking that it looks as if he has his work cut out for him in caucus tomorrow. I hope he takes advantage of the opportunity to work on his colleagues, because I know where his heart is and what his feelings are.

At the hearings in Owen Sound in March, 1970, about 95 per cent of the people making submissions said that they believed the railway passenger service should continue and that it should be upgraded. In spite of this, the Canadian Transport Commission seemed to pay more attention to the submissions of the bus companies and the railway companies because they made this ruling:

This committee finds that the highway system serving the points in this region of Ontario served by the passenger-train services is excellent and is probably as extensive as could be found in any comparable area of Canada. The committee further finds that the existing bus services in the area constitute a satisfactory alternative public transportation service and the committee accepts the evidence adduced at the hearings that these bus services will be adequate in capacity and will be increased in frequency as required by traffic demands resulting from discontinuance of passenger-train services.

The committee agrees with the submissions of both railways that discontinuance would have a minimal effect on other passenger-train services. The committee has considered the effect on other passenger carriers and, as explained above, has concluded that the bus services can adequately serve the additional traffic.

If some of the members of the railway transport committee had been with us last week when we attended hearings in western Ontario, they would have found out that their conclusions were incorrect. A brief presented by the Wingham Business and Professional Women's Club stated that it takes 4½ hours to go to Toronto by bus and takes 6½ hours to return, but by car it only takes 2 to 2½ hours travelling within the speed limit. At weekends the bus takes a different route and less time. The brief pointed out that the main problems with the bus service are that it is slow, it is uncomfortable, there are no wash-rooms on the buses and there is no place to get even a cup of coffee. It is no wonder that the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) said it would be just as quick to use a horse—if you had a fast horse, it would be a lot faster. This sort of thing was brought to light in almost all the briefs that were concerned with the passenger service in that area since the railways abandoned their service; indeed, some were concerned with the type of service that had existed even when the railways were operating.

Another reason for the necessity of adequate transportation in that area was presented by the reeve of Bayfield,