

discontinue freight service by letting the trestles rot. Then it told the Canadian Transport Commission that it was too expensive to repair them, and it would have to let the freight service go as well.

I would like to give some background on a situation which I consider heinous. I think the CPR have done the worst job of public relations that I have ever seen them do in the way that they have handled, mishandled, or botched the situation on Vancouver Island concerning the Esquimalt-Nanaimo railroad. I would like to quote a condition concerning this railroad:

In 1883 and 1884, legislation was passed by the Dominion and Provincial Governments for the construction of a railway from Esquimalt to Nanaimo. The contractor was a Vancouver Island businessman, Mr. Robert Dunsmuir and Associates. The terms of construction specified that "The character of the Railway and its equipment shall be in all respects equal to the general character of the Canadian Pacific Railway, now under construction in British Columbia and the equipment thereof." It also stated "that the said Contractors shall commence the works embraced in this Contract forthwith and shall complete and equip the same by the 10th day of June 1887 . . ."

One of the other conditions for this railroad was that the federal government, through legislation, authorized the construction and contributed the sum of \$750,000 to the construction of a railway from Esquimalt to Nanaimo. The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, as a result of this grant from the federal government and as a result of a grant from the province of British Columbia, agreed to carry out, and I quote:

—truly and in good faith to keep and maintain the same, and the rolling stock required therefor, in good and efficient working and running order, and shall continuously and in good faith operate the same—

After making that statement, and receiving grants from the province of British Columbia and a grant from the federal government, the railway said they would carry out in good faith and in good order the operation of that railway continuously.

Let me tell you what has happened since then. I will let you decide, Mr. Speaker, whether in fact the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, which was subsequently taken over by the CPR in 1912, has carried out that promise. It is almost like a tale of horror. Starting in approximately 1969 the CPR, in one form or another, have sought to cut off this service which they said they would maintain as a result of obtaining funds and land from both the provincial and federal sources.

● (1732)

In 1970 public hearings were held on an application by Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to discontinue passenger service. I should like to quote some of the evidence given before the Canadian Transport Commission in order to apprise the House of the situation which was existent regarding passenger service. The CTC indicated that it became apparent, as far as advertising was concerned, that very little had been done by E & N. One must remember we are talking about a railway; we are not talking about a service from one house to another in a town. In 1969, E & N spent the grand total of \$150 advertising the services of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company which serviced Victoria to Cour-

### *Transportation*

tenay. I realize \$150 was a grand sum of money in 1969, and that \$150 was spent on advertising the service of a railway line on Vancouver Island. That amount was used to publish a timetable. That was the total expense of the Canadian Pacific Railway on Vancouver Island to advertise its service. I hesitate to say that Canadian Pacific was in fact doing no advertising because it allocated the \$150. But I wonder about the sincerity of that organization and whether it really wanted to keep that line in operation. Were they ready, willing or able to advertise to people from all parts of Canada and the United States that such a service existed and that they would actually promote it for tourism? Even if the local residents were forgotten about, it appears to me that particular corporation had no intention whatsoever of advising people who would use that service that in fact it even existed.

I should like to refer to some of the things E & N did to maintain its passenger service:

According to the evidence given at the hearing, many station platforms were in dangerous condition or overgrown with weeds and various undergrowth; station buildings and shelters were in a state of disrepair, and all stations were closed and locked on Saturdays and holidays. The equipment used at that time was one RDC-3 (rail diesel car) unit consisting of a baggage compartment (where no baggage, express or mail was carried) and a passenger compartment with 48 seats. Further evidence indicated that "the baggage compartment is used to seat passengers when from time to time all the seats in the passenger compartment are full . . ."

I am not sure whether the E & N was really concerned with providing a passenger service. The stations were in a state of disrepair. As I say, they were closed on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays. At times passengers were put in the luggage compartment because there was no room in the passenger compartment. When I indicated that this was a tale of horror, I meant it. Is this indicative of a company which wishes to progress and carry on with its passenger service, or would this be a company which was attempting to get out of passenger service by providing the worst possible service under the worst possible conditions to encourage people not to use its service?

The answer to that is obvious. At that time the CTC laid down certain regulations which E & N would have to abide by. It is almost unbelievable that the Canadian Transport Commission would have to tell a transportation company such elementary things as, first, that it must maintain in a good state of repair all its passenger stations, shelters and platforms on the line between Victoria and Courtenay, British Columbia; second, that it has to keep all such stations and shelters in a clean, sanitary and safe condition. Is it revolutionary to have to tell the CPR to keep its facilities clean? The CTC had to do that because E & N were not keeping them clean. In other words, the customers were being told that their business was not wanted, and the faster they quit using the service, the faster E & N could go to the CTC in order to tell the commission that its operation was non-economic. The CTC was required to tell E & N that it must keep its stations and shelters in a clean, sanitary and safe condition. In other words, they were not in a safe condition when these recommendations were made.

Third, they were told to keep their stations and shelters open for suitable periods of time on all days on which the Esquimalt