

Committee on Railways and Shipping

13, 1954, the chairman of the Canadian Pacific stated as follows:

(Text):

Canada's resource industries share with agriculture the distinction of forming the backbone of the export trade upon which national prosperity depends. A country which derives more than 20 per cent of its national income from exports dependent for their competitive advantage in world markets upon a price measured in part in terms of transportation cost cannot afford to remain indifferent to those problems which affect the railroads in their ability to meet new as well as existing transportation needs.

(Translation):

Railways have been the spearheads of Canada's economic development. The district of which I have the pleasure of being one of the representatives has witnessed a new expansion at the end of the last century when it was linked by rail with the city of Quebec.

The railroad, built chiefly to open up new settlements and provide a new outlet for existing parishes, has not followed the progress of our district.

It has remained a settler's railroad. It is a slow, winding road, dotted with decrepit stations, where trains are seldom on time. It is becoming more and more urgent that improvements be made, that the railroad be shortened and modernized so as to meet adequately the needs of our district, which has become a great industrial area, and of our constantly increasing population.

(Text):

"One of the best tests of whether a people can see, in the economic sense, beyond its nose," says the editor of that internationally known journal, *The Economist* of London, "is in its attitude to transport, for transport, although absolutely essential to economic progress, confers its benefits indirectly."

(Translation):

The relevancy of that remark prompts me to speak of the necessity of undertaking as soon as possible the construction of the Chibougamau-St. Felicien railroad.

On January 25 last, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marler), in reply to a question of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer), stated that he had no intention of introducing a bill about this matter during the present session. At the last session, legislation for that purpose was enacted by parliament. Unfortunately for us, none of its clauses compels the Canadian National to build that railroad within a set time, or provides anything to that effect.

In short, clause 1 prescribes that the governor in council may provide for the construction and the completion, in whole or in part, of the lines described in the appendix, before December 31, 1964.

Some reporters questioned Mr. McGregor in Edmonton some months ago about the incidents over Moose Jaw. They queried him regarding the questions I had asked in the house, and he had this to say:

Mr. Thatcher seems to assume that T.C.A. and the R.C.A.F. stand at opposite ends of a hall and shout at each other. Actually, there is very good co-operation between the two.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that such a statement is not an answer. If there is such good co-operation, then why are these incidents continuing? Mr. McGregor cannot afford to brush aside such proposals. If a proposal is not feasible, then I wish he would state clearly the reason. I hope the committee will investigate this whole matter when Mr. McGregor appears before it within a few days.

Another suggestion made was that T.C.A. aircraft, when flying over military areas, should fly at 8,000 or 9,000 feet instead of at 6,000, as at present. Most of the Harvard training aircraft simply cannot fly that high. The department replied to this suggestion by stating:

The establishment of such minima might be imprudent in that they might require an aircraft to maintain an altitude which had become unsatisfactory due to local weather conditions.

Such a statement might be correct six or eight days in the year, but how about the other 350 or 360 days? I believe that if T.C.A. would fly at 8,000 feet there would be almost no accidents from collision. And if their planes had to come down because of storms, then they could notify control towers at the military airports in advance, and thus lessen the danger.

Some have suggested that the sensible thing to do would be to move all military airports from areas in which Trans-Canada Air Lines operate. I do not think this is a sensible suggestion. In the first place there would be a considerable number of airports to move. In the second place the cost would be absolutely prohibitive. In the third place, if the stations were removed I believe the military authorities would find it much more difficult to recruit. Certainly it has been found that personnel like to be near the larger centres.

I say again there are certain elementary safety steps which look reasonable to a layman. I hope that the minister or Mr. McGregor will answer these proposals before the committee. If the suggestions are not sensible, then let them die once and for all. But at least let there be a full explanation.

(Translation):

Mr. Paul E. Gagnon (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, in a talk delivered before the Canadian railway club in Montreal, on December