

Transportation

record—has been of particular benefit to the prairies. I recall that it was brought out at hearings of the committee that this bridge subsidy had a considerable effect on reducing the cost of farm machinery. As the minister knows, it gives the manufacturer on the prairies an opportunity to compete with manufacturers in the east. This subsidy, as I have said, has been of great value to the prairies and I should like the minister to explain just what is happening with regard to its cancellation. The whole of this \$7 million is being removed. Does this mean that the railways will have to raise their rates, or get more business in order to offset this loss?

Mr. Pickersgill: The best way for me to explain what is happening would be to read from the bill itself. If the hon. gentleman would look at 468A (2) he would see that it says:

The commission shall, one year after the coming into force of Part V of the National Transportation Act, authorize such increases in the rates to which subsection (1) applies as in the opinion of the commission would, if put wholly into effect, yield the Canadian National Railway Company, combined, three million dollars, approximately, of additional annual revenues.

Then subsection 3 says the same thing for the following year, only it is two million dollars instead of three million dollars, and for the following year it is another two million dollars. Then, at the end of the three years, it expires. This conforms precisely to the request made by the government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Pascoe: Thank you. I just thought I should like to have this put on record, because this bridge subsidy means a great deal to the prairies.

Clause 74 as amended agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: We are now on clause 1.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

On clause 1—*National Transportation Policy*

Mr. Rynard: We have been talking for the most part about transportation over long distances and the abandonment of rail lines. I think we should take a look at the growth of Canada, the increase in its population, and realise that in the year 2,000 it will have a population of between 40 million and 50 million people.

I wish to speak about an area which I know, though the circumstances there are duplicated in many places across the country. I

[Mr. Pascoe.]

will take the province of Ontario, a province with a population of six millions which in the year 2,000 will have grown to approximately 12 million people. About one third of the people who live in Canada live today in the province of Ontario. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that about half the people included in that one third live within approximately 100 miles of the city of Toronto. This is a congested area at the present time. In rough figures, a million people go to work, and return, morning and night in Toronto, and in the 100 mile area. The highways which they travel are already overcrowded and the point has been reached at which it is almost impossible technically, and certainly unwise economically, to take more land for throughways and super highways.

It must also be borne in mind that this is a popular tourist area. This part of Ontario projects so far south in the direction of the United States that the southern part of the province lies south of the northernmost point of the state of California. This means we probably have more American tourists than does any other part of Canada. We cannot cut these people off. Most of them come by car, and we need their dollars to help our balance of payments. So this is the position we are in: We find people going to work, one or two in a car, over highways which are already congested. Thousands of individual cars are travelling into a crowded area when their occupants could be carried more efficiently by train, or other rapid transit. Roughly a million people travel to and from work in this area. One railway line would carry a lot of them into the heart of the city or industrial area, and would eliminate parking problems.

● (9:00 p.m.)

We are facing a serious problem in air pollution. It takes a motorist in Toronto about an hour to get from downtown to the city limits in the rush hour. He could travel 60 miles in the country in the same length of time, burning approximately the same amount of gas. This is an indication of the amount of pollution and congestion in that area and indicates the need for a rapid transit system.

No railway line in Ontario should be abandoned, and I feel this also applies to many other industrial areas of Canada. In the near future we shall have to rebuild some of the abandoned lines in order to move people to and from work. It is penny wise and pound foolish to abandon railways in a province like