Supply—Transport

British Columbia government had the authority to order a resumption of a daily passenger service on the Kootenay valley railway between Nelson and Vancouver. This leaves the citizens of this area in the

unhappy position of having to continue with a totally inadequate rail service until such a time as the board of railway transport decides the matter. In other words, we in the Kootenays are entirely at the mercy of a board over which no one, not even parliament, has any control. Our only recourse seems to be to keep bombarding the transport board with our complaints.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I made some representations in connection with this question, which is of serious concern to the people of southeastern British Columbia, and failed to get any response from the minister, which was quite unusual. Usually he is quite ready to reply; in fact he has replied on a number of occasions to much more inconsequential questions than I posed. Is the editorial correct in stating that "our only recourse seems to be to keep bombarding the transport board with our complaints"?

Mr. Hees: Yes, this is a matter wholly within the jurisdiction of the board of transport commissioners.

Mr. Herridge: Then the minister admits he can do nothing to assist us as Minister of Transport for Canada?

Mr. Hees: I have done everything I possibly can. I have drawn the matter to the attention of all the people I can, and that is as far as I can go.

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring up a few matters concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and the present sad state of the Cornwall canal. My reservations about the St. Lawrence seaway and my solicitude for the present Minister of Transport, who has the unenviable job of making it work efficiently, are well known. I have the greatest admiration for the present minister, who has met emergency after emergency with unfailing courage, imagination and ability. He and his colleagues are performing prodigies of technical efficiency in keeping the seaway working as well as it does.

Mr. Pickersgill: Did the minister write that speech?

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): My resentment against those who were responsible for depriving my home town of the canal which also well known. The hon. member for Laurier, in his capacity as former minister of transport and former member for Stormont, several months ago had the temerity to tell the people made to see whether it would be desirable to of Cornwall that our city was on the seaway drain a small branch of the Cornwall canal

[Mr. Herridge.]

because of some dredging nearby. What monumental cynicism. What kind of seaway is it that has a canal which ends in a concrete wall 80 feet high?

If anybody has any illusions about Cornwall still being on the seaway, one has only to compare the premises of the Cornwall canal with the premises of the Eisenhower lock or even the condition of the Cornwall canal some years ago. The banks of the Cornwall canal are now almost a garbage dump where they used to be a park. The Cornwall canal is now a stagnant backwater where it used to be an international waterway, a window on the world. Before the Cornwall canal was abandoned in favour of the Chevrier waterway it was possible to keep the premises in far better condition. I would still urge the minister, in the interests of employment in the area and the beauty of Cornwall, that more be done to preserve and maintain the canal, even though it is no longer a waterway that is vital to trade.

The hon. member for Laurier appears to have an uneasy conscience as a result of the damage done to Cornwall by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway locks on the United States side, because several days ago he brought up in this house the matter of pollution in the Cornwall canal about which I had already communicated with the departmental officials. I welcome his interference in my constituency, because I think it is highly commendable that he should endeavour to remedy the ravages done by the seaway. I fear, however, that he may be ignoring his new friends in Laurier, though at least they have the consolation that he is not now in a position, as an ordinary member, to do the same damage as he would be if he were a minister.

The Deputy Chairman: Order.

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): I am proceeding further.

The Deputy Chairman: I would hope the hon. member will come back to the item.

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would strongly urge the minister to ignore any recommendations that the Cornwall canal be closed. It would be disastrous if Cornwall were deprived of what is left of the Cornwall canal. Many men with long service in the Department of Transport would be deprived of their jobs, and the access for occasional ships going to one of flowed by its doors for over 100 years is Cornwall's most flourishing industries would be cut off if the remainder of the canal were closed.

However, may I suggest that a study be