

Breton and through Cape Breton to Newfoundland. Neither have I used the saving to be effected in passenger traffic, and the delays which would be overcome. I am leaving these two things out of the picture, which in the judgment of competent railway men would amount to two or three hundred thousand dollars annually. My reason for not taking them into consideration is that undoubtedly there will be some incidental expenses in connection with the new proposals which must be given consideration, and which can very well be taken care of from this source. I have tried to point out the different proposals and the cost of each, and to prove in each case that the financing will take care of itself over a reasonable period of years.

First, there is the proposal to regrade the railway from Sydney to Truro, with a causeway across the strait of Canso, costing \$26,000,000.

Second, there is the revision of the railway from Sydney to Moncton, with a bridge across the strait of Canso, \$44,000,000.

Third, there is the revision of the railway from Sydney to Moncton, with causeway across the strait of Canso, \$36,000,000.

I will deal briefly with the necessity for the proposed change. In the first place the condition of the roadbed, curves and grades is such that no comment is needed, other than to point out how ridiculous it appears, particularly to visitors to see a couple of locomotives chugging along hauling eighteen or twenty cars of freight. From the point of view of the passengers, they get no sleep on account of the twisting and rolling, are unable to read or write and if they want a meal the jolting is liable to spill the food all over their clothes. As a matter of fact, it is dangerous to walk through the cars unless there is something to hold onto. It requires almost fourteen hours to travel from Sydney to Halifax, a distance of 289 miles, or an average speed of approximately twenty-one miles per hour.

The following table gives the running time of the trains, and the miles per hour:

	Miles	Running time including stoppages	Miles per Hour
No. 6 morning train ..	289	12½	23·12
No. 8 evening train ..	289	13½	21·02
No. 10 evening train ..	289	14½	19·59

Mr. MacMillan continues:

I suggest that, for your information, you take note of what the railway economist, Mr. Fairweather, had to say about this condition in his evidence before the parliamentary committee, at page 399:

"Then you would still have the problem of getting to a point near Truro, because the line of railway from Mulgrave to Truro, let us say, or New Glasgow, is a line that was built in the early days when railroading was not as well developed as it is now. It is not a good line. It is expensive to haul over it, and you cannot, unfortunately, improve it because the people who built it just went over the tops of the hills."

In his evidence Mr. Fairweather refers to the capital cost and insufficient returns. I have tried to deal with that phase of the situation.

His next objection is increased maintenance cost, depreciation, et cetera. I cannot see how anyone can argue along that line, as undoubtedly with a new alignment, reduced curvature, and a well ballasted roadbed, while the cost would be higher for maintenance than at present there certainly would be a big decrease in the maintenance of rolling stock. The wear and tear on the rolling equipment on the present road must be out of all proportion to the mileage. As to depreciation, there is the depreciation on the present road. In addition to this, there is depreciation on the ferry steamers and the fact that the present steamer will have to be replaced within a few years, as it has been in the service twenty-nine years.

Again the argument is advanced that we will return to pre-war freight after the war. It should be noted that I have used in my calculations the 1937 tonnage, and at that time coal was being shipped by water to St. Lawrence ports. The rail tonnage in that year was, I am reliably informed, 1,300,000 tons. I have used for my purposes 1,500,000 tons. Surely I am justified in increasing the estimate by 200,000 tons, which will be 900,000 tons less than the 1943 tonnage. We cannot agree for one minute that we will go backward instead of forward.

From the post-war rehabilitation point of view, I know of no project that could be undertaken which would take care of so many returned men, or men who might lose their positions through the dislocation of industry than this proposal. You will find on page 400 of the evidence taken before the parliamentary committee, that Mr. Fairweather states this proposal would give employment to 7,000 men for three years. My opinion is that it would take care of 8,000 men, which would mean approximately 7,000,000 days work in three years, and would undoubtedly take up all the slack in so far as ordinary labour in the maritime provinces is concerned.

If a bridge is decided on, it has been suggested that it would be difficult to hold the piers in the strait on account of currents, floating ice, et cetera. I would point out that the highway bridge across the Annapolis is built on similar piers, and is subject to floating ice conditions and an eight-knot current, whereas the strait of Canso has only a four-knot current. We have experienced no difficulty on this account at the Annapolis river bridge.

Another objection raised is that a causeway crossing the strait would prevent the ice from passing through the strait to the Atlantic, and it would remain in the bay and cause late springs. Records show that only a very small percentage of the ice passes through the strait, but that the next tide forces it back and eventually it remains in the bay until a southeasterly wind drives it back and it finds its way around to the Atlantic through the gulf of St. Lawrence and Cabot strait.

This report, Mr. Chairman, I think has been well thought out and well prepared, and I believe it should be given favourable consideration by the minister. I thank the committee for its courtesy in allowing me to present these statements this evening.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I want to bring two matters to the attention of the minister; one is national in scope and the second affects