

*Transportation*

The following is a condensation of some, although not necessarily all, of the testimony given and the submissions filed:

1. That the present service is inadequate by reason of:

(a) the curtailed service between Penticton and Vancouver;

(b) the stopovers required at Penticton and Nelson;

(c) the excessive length of time necessary to travel to and from Vancouver;

(d) the lack of provision of meals or any catering service.

2. That the railway company has failed to develop and promote passenger traffic.

3. That the deficiencies mentioned above are the reasons for the decline in passenger traffic.

4. That the actions or inaction of the railway company has been part of a design to drive away an unwanted passenger business.

5. That the alternative means of transportation are inadequate. In particular, that the occasions when planes are unable to land at Castlegar airport are so numerous in the winter months as to make that service unreliable.

6. That the cost of travel by airplane is prohibitive for some persons.

7. That the bus service is an impossible means of travel for disabled veterans who have to report at Shaughnessy hospital for treatment; that they can travel by air but would on occasion report to Castlegar airport in sufficient time to be in Vancouver on the required date only to find that the plane could not land.

8. That the train service is necessary generally for aged, sick and infirm persons who require treatment at Calgary or Vancouver.

9. That the losses on passenger travel should be absorbed by the presumably profitable freight traffic on the line. (In this connection I should mention that the board stated at the hearing that, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it would assume that the freight traffic on the line is profitable).

10. That the railway company should promote the passenger service actively and that the results should be assessed again in one year's time.

11. That the value of the service should be considered from the standpoint of civil defence or disaster.

12. That the removal of the trains would be a setback to the areas.

13. That the services ancillary to the train are poor, as for example the inability at certain places to find out whether or not the train is on time, the waiting room facilities, etc.

14. That the presumably profitable operations of Canadian Pacific Airlines and the railway company's highway services should be weighed.

15. That the schedules of trains could be changed to improve arrival and departure times and to connect more closely with the arrivals and departures of other means of public transportation.

● (9:00 p.m.)

16. That the service between Lethbridge and Calgary be changed to coincide with the arrival of trains 45 and 46 in Lethbridge.

[Mr. Herridge.]

17. That no action be taken by the board until a complete and co-ordinated national transportation policy has been worked out.

That is why I am making these representations on clause 1 of the bill. To continue:

18. That by reason of certain anticipated developments the areas are on the threshold of great expansion, which would promote more passenger travel.

There are many other reasons given in opposition to the abandonment of this service. I wish now to deal briefly with the history of the line. The history of the Kettle Valley railway is an interesting and colourful one. There is no purpose in going into it in detail here. It is sufficient to say that the line, in its several portions and as a whole, has played an important part in retaining for Canada those parts of southern British Columbia which were falling under the influence of the United States through their dependence upon American transportation.

I have been very interested in the development of rail transportation in the interior of British Columbia. I have read the history of the struggle between Canadian and United States railroads which at one time tried to secure a monopoly of rail transportation in southeastern British Columbia. I might say in passing that in 1914 a survey was made at the instigation of the federal government of the possibility of transporting prairie grain from Revelstoke to the sea, down the Columbia, and this was found to be feasible, given boats of a certain size. However, grants were made available by the federal government for the extension of the Kettle Valley railroad in order to maintain the east-west flow of traffic in Canada which was so greatly to Canada's advantage. Therefore the report resulting from the investigation which I mentioned has not been accepted by the government of the day.

I think it is most unfair that the C.P.R. should decline to continue its passenger service because the company lost, I understand, close on half a million dollars at the time the railway was abandoned between Vancouver and Medicine Hat. I think it is most unfair to separate freight receipts from passenger receipts. The company should be obliged to provide figures to show profits on freight receipts as well as any losses on passenger traffic.

I have mentioned that traffic was discouraged. This was done in several ways. First of all there was an unfortunate incident related to the action of the Sons of Freedom in blowing up the railway. That was not as