

*Transportation*

What about the savings that would be effected in the upkeep of tracks and in the upkeep of roadbeds? What about the savings that would be effected by the use of one station at each place, instead of two stations? Then, of course, there are the other buildings that are appended to such an operation. One more very important factor to consider, Mr. Speaker, is land use. Here we have two rights of way running through some of the greatest agricultural areas in Canada. Economists well believe that before too many years, if not now, there will not be enough land available in the world to feed all the people in the world. Therefore we must conserve these areas particularly. I am sure there must be many other areas in a similar position throughout this country of ours. I say that there are many facets of this subject of rationalization to consider. There are many things we should be considering, some of which we have not considered.

This problem we are having in connection with transportation is not something new; it goes back many years. I am going to quote some of the thoughts of Right Hon. Arthur Meighen on this subject back in 1932 or 1933, and for this purpose I shall read from the third volume of a book written by Roger Graham. There is one chapter here about which we should think for just a moment. This is written about a man who was a champion of private enterprise, and of giving all kinds of people an opportunity in this competitive country of ours. I quote:

The question of how to deal with the railway problem, which had been before the country for so long, was one of the few important subjects on which Meighen ever changed his mind. Up to the 1930's no one had resisted more adamantly or outspokenly than he the notion, consistently advanced by C.P.R. officials and always finding some political support, that the two great railway systems should in some way be merged. By the time the Duff Commission reported, however,—

I think that was 1934.

—he had become convinced that unification of some sort was the most hopeful way out. "Confidentially," he wrote to a member of the commission, "I may tell you that I have been for two years firmly of opinion that the interests of the whole nation would be best served by a placing of the one road under the other for co-operation, and a distribution of the earnings among the securities of both in an equitable manner . . . The public interests will be looked after by the railway commission supplemented by additional powers from parliament, if desired." What had brought him to a conclusion he had so often rejected in the past? For one thing, what seemed to him the carnival of extravagance which marked Thornton's presidency of the C.N.R. has disillusioned

him somewhat with public ownership of railways in practice. The trouble lay not in the experiment of public ownership having been tried in the first place, as Beatty was contending in a series of public speeches, but in the way the experiment had been conducted after 1922 when Thornton had succeeded D. B. Hanna.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we should give very serious thought to a scientific and economic study of transportation, a study in depth taking into consideration air, rail, shipping, pipe lines, etc. I mean a study in depth and not just one of those superficial things. For instance, after the second world war the then Liberal administration—I am going to throw them a bouquet because I think it is due them—set aside \$50 million a year for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. This was a good thing. As a result of this move Canada today is recognized as one of the leading nations of the world in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. This was a far sighted program. What about the future now? Are we far sighted?

When the last spike was driven in the trans-Canada railway, we sat back with a feeling that we had it made. Things have changed. We are in a new era. We have to look for new means of transportation. Perhaps some of these things may seem to be away out in left field. Our big problem today is simply this, that we have to move goods and people and move them quickly and economically. In so far as bulk products are concerned, for instance, we may consider the pipe line. The movement of oil and gas by pipe line has been a great boon to this country. One cannot imagine moving such a great volume of oil or gas by any other medium at the present time.

● (7:20 p.m.)

Let us consider this in terms of other bulk items, because there may be ways more economical than those now used. The University of Alberta at the present time is studying new techniques—techniques which would amaze you—for the movement of bulk products by pipe line, such things as coal and sulphur. And why not?

I recently read an article—which I did try to find, but failed, because I thought it particularly interesting—which reported that a group of economists in the United States had stated that in ten years sulphur would become one of the most valuable items in our way of life. Put packages wrapped in neoprene, or whatever they wish to use, into a

[Mr. Irvine.]