

*Transportation*

pipe line, and it takes very little effort to move them great distances.

These ideas may be somewhat far out, but we have to look ahead to new ideas and techniques. For example, has it ever been considered that instead of using railway lines it might be cheaper to ship our wheat year round from the lakehead? Of course, this would entail the use of icebreakers and nuclear reactors, but how much would this cost us? Has a study ever been made to determine its feasibility? It might be more expedient to do this, in view of the volume of bulk products which can be carried in ships.

Has any thought been given to the movement of wheat through a pipe line from, say, the prairies to Halifax, or from the prairies to Vancouver, or from the prairies to Churchill? There are of course complexities and difficulties here. These are some of the things we should be thinking about.

According to the information I have, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is doing preliminary research at the present time into the high speed movement of commuters and commuter traffic through pneumatic tubes at speeds of up to 350 miles per hour. What have we done to study such a possibility? Would it not be wonderful for the members who live in Toronto, if they could hop into a capsule and arrive in Ottawa 45 minutes later. Or, for example, the members who live in Montreal could commute back and forth each day in 20 minutes. Think of the advantages of this system when a vote was called, and we would not have to ring the bells for any longer than an hour and a half before every member was here. These are matters we should be looking into.

This proposal is nothing new. Let me take members back to the old-fashioned store we used to visit 35 years ago. Perhaps some of those present did not do so, but I did because I am in that age bracket. We remember the tubes which used to hang above the counters. Your money was put in a little capsule, shoved into this tube, and whoooosh!—away it went to the office, and then came back with your change. This new idea is exactly the same system, only on a much larger plane. We must project our thinking into the future and consider these new technologies and what we can do with them.

What will be the modern way 10 or 20 years from now of transporting something or somebody from Edmonton to Montreal? Will it be by pipe line, will it be by hovercraft,

will it be by rocket, or will it be by pneumatic tube? People may laugh at this, but they laughed at the Wright brothers who 65 to 70 years ago said that they were going to fly in an aeroplane. Since that time aviation has done pretty well; but at that the time they were ridiculed. People thought they were a bunch of kooks. This is a time for reflection and thought, a time to use imagination, foresight and initiative in planning tomorrow's transportation. I would suggest that such a study is a very important consideration at this particular time.

I was much in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas) but which was not allowed by your deputy, Mr. Speaker. It was an unfortunate thing because I feel that it would be only fair and sensible to refer this bill to the committee on transport and communications, where it could be further studied. An opportunity would be given to hear witnesses in order that many members, myself included, could go into the complexities of the bill, ask questions and receive responsible answers.

The action we take today may be binding upon us for many years to come, so let us not be in a hurry. I do not think there is any point in our trying to hurry this legislation. We have given up the major part of what was to have been a summer recess. I do not think that anyone feels sorry for himself for that. Most hon. members feel that their responsibility is to this country of ours, and if we are needed here we should be here. I would suggest that we sit right on, take our time and make sure of this legislation before we complete second reading.

It would not be fair to mention names, but people on both sides of the house have confided to me that they do not know what this bill is all about. I suggest they should have knowledge of this legislation before deciding to stand up and be counted—instead of being counted on something about which at the present time some of them may have no knowledge. Let us review the matter in committee and get the answers we want to our questions.

I think many people want to vote for a transportation bill, and I am one of them. I should like to vote for this transportation bill if it were amended in certain respects, and if we were given the opportunity to discuss it in committee so that we might have a more complete and profound understanding of it. If that were done, Mr. Speaker, would it not be