

Transportation

study adequately the entire contents of the bill as quickly and profoundly as it should be studied. I am sure there are many people here in the house, including myself, who recognize the fact that a bill is necessary and who would like to vote for it, but before voting on it we should like to have a better understanding of it.

I think that perhaps when this piece of legislation was put together three or four persons could have sat down and condensed it into capsule form, containing maybe 20 chapters. I find on reading the bill that some of its clauses are quite contradictory.

For example in the explanatory notes which appear on the unnumbered second page of the bill it said:

Part I of this bill deals with the proposed Canadian Transport Commission which would replace the present Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada, the Air Transport Board and the Canadian Maritime Commission. Parts II and III would make provision for two other modes of transport, namely commodity pipe lines and extraprovincial motor vehicle transport.

This is quite clear to most of us. However, if we refer to page 6 of the bill we will find an outline of the personnel of this board, which is to consist of 17 members. I believe that previously these three bodies were manned by 13 people. I will not attempt to suggest that this is another effort at empire building because I do not think it is intentionally so. I do not want to be particularly argumentative in this matter, because I think we should approach the bill, not in a partisan manner but as fellow Canadians with a common interest.

I would also like to congratulate the minister on his description of the bill. Perhaps it would have been better to have heard not quite as lengthy a description from several hon. members on both sides of this house.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is what an opposition is for.

Mr. Irvine: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have some questions to ask of the minister which I hope he will answer at the end of this debate. I would like to know how many states of the United States are served by the C.N.R. branch or subsidiary lines. I am referring in particular to the Grand Trunk line which runs through to Chicago and serves intermediate points. It is my understanding that 13 states are served by this line but I would like to have this corroborated by the minister. I would also like to know whether that portion of the railway system is subsidized by

our government and if so to what extent. Can the minister also inform us whether the intent of this bill is to bring an end to transport subsidies? Nowhere in the bill is this actually spelled out in black and white.

As everyone knows, we have recently been hit by a severe rail strike. Having carried a union card myself some years ago I am well aware of the trials and tribulations of the railway workers. I am of the opinion that as a result of Bill C-230 we will find ourselves saddled with an expenditure of an extra \$100 million. I would like to know where this money will come from. Will it come from increased freight rates? It is my understanding that the rates in the west are somewhat higher than they are in this part of the country. I understand further that in some instances, the rates in the east are higher than in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Ontario and Quebec comprise what we might call the economic breadbasket, or at least the industrial breadbasket, of Canada. I am afraid these areas are going to have to carry the brunt of the increases. The people of Quebec and Ontario should be apprised of this situation in advance. This is going to be a tough blow to us industrially. It could also be a tough blow to us in trying to capture and keep some of those foreign markets, which are so important to our balance of payments picture.

• (7:10 p.m.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said in this bill with regard to rationalization. What about rationalization? In the riding I have the pleasure to represent, the city of London, we have a service that runs from London to Windsor, a distance of about 120 miles. We have one Canadian National and one Canadian Pacific line paralleling each other. So far as passenger trains are concerned, the schedules are almost identical. What a waste of money this is. These are double-tracked lines and there is no reason in the world why an arrangement could not be made whereby one line would be used. I feel that the direction for this course should come from us. There are many savings which could be effected. For instance, what about the grade separation program, toward which I believe we pay 75 per cent or 80 per cent of the cost? I know of two or three grade separations that are under study at the moment in the city of London. I do not know about Chatham or Windsor, but I am sure the hon. member for Kent, Ont. (Mr. Danforth) would have some information about that.