

Supply—Transport

the railway had made a count of the traffic, and according to their figures 10,000 automobiles and trucks crossed over that intersection inside of forty-eight hours. There were also 187 trains which went by and 89 switchings with all the inconvenience and delay such a procedure normally causes. Of course these figures are disputed by those who are convinced that they know better than the railways what the real situation is. They want another count. They also want to know how long traffic is held up and the number of vehicles that are affected by these delays from time to time. The *Port Credit Weekly*, which is a very reputable newspaper with one of the widest and most influential lists of subscribers of any comparable area in Canada, has this to say:

In this report the Canadian National Railways said there were 89 switchings during the 48-hour period. We didn't see any statement of how long traffic was tied up by the switchings or the number of vehicles delayed by trains across the roadway. We would suggest that the railway or somebody vitally interested in the project take another count from this standpoint. We have seen cars lined up for blocks at this crossing not for a few minutes but in some cases for as long as a quarter of an hour.

Feeling is running strong, and when I say it is running strong I am very moderate in the term I use. The situation has reached a point where I felt I ought to bring the matter to the floor of the house because there is such frustration in the minds of so many of those in the area. I want to say to the minister and to the committee that I do not think Canadian National Railways should have brushed off such a reasonable proposal as was made on that occasion. I express the hope that the matter will be pursued by the municipalities and the provincial highway department so that the board of transport commissioners will have the opportunity at as early a date as possible to make a thorough inquiry and to deliver a judgment giving us our subway on what we hope will be equitable terms. I only rose on this occasion because I am so impressed with the seriousness of the traffic and safety situation at that point.

Mr. Wright: There are two matters I should like to bring to the attention of the minister at this time. Earlier today we passed Bill No. 192 which provides for the construction of a branch line of the Canadian National Railways from Terrace to Kitimat in British Columbia. Last session we passed a bill providing for the construction of a branch line of Canadian National Railways from Sheridon to Lynn Lake in Manitoba, a distance of some 150 miles.

Mr. Chevrier: I think I can see what is coming.

Mr. Wright: These two branch lines are to be built to develop known natural resources of the dominion and the house consented unanimously to the passage of the bills providing for railway extensions to develop known mineral resources which should be developed. A few years ago we passed a private bill granting a charter to a private company to build a railway line from seaboard into northern Quebec and Labrador for the development of the great iron ore resources there. Some of us on this side would have liked to see that development undertaken by Canadian National Railways, but although we objected to the method we agreed that the line should be built.

I want to point out to the minister that there is a known agricultural resource in the northeastern part of Saskatchewan and northwestern part of Manitoba which cannot be developed further until such time as there is an extension of the present railway lines in this area. Some twenty-five years ago two railway branch lines were built, one from Melfort to Carrot River and the other from Reserve Junction to Arborfield. When these branch lines were constructed it was expected by the people who had settled there and were living in the area—in fact it was stated by the railway at that time—that the lines would be continued through to The Pas in Manitoba to connect with the Hudson Bay Railway. Unfortunately just about the time the lines should have been extended the war broke out and for over five years we were so busily engaged that extensions of railway lines were forgotten.

I point out now that seven years after the last war the lines are still at the point to which they were built some twenty-five years ago. Since that time settlement has extended some forty to fifty miles to the east from this area. Immediately after the war hundreds of returned men settled there under the Veterans Land Act, many of them being from thirty to fifty miles from the closest railway point. I do not know whether members realize just what that means, but the cost of hauling grain to railhead runs from half a cent a mile per bushel to a cent a mile per bushel. When you try to develop land forty miles from the railhead it means that it costs you 20 cents a bushel to deliver every bushel of grain to your closest delivery point.

On the other hand, once the grain has reached that point it is hauled from there to the head of the lakes, and in the case of Arborfield and Carrot River the cost is 24 cents a hundred or 16 cents a bushel. The grain is hauled approximately 1,000 miles for 16 cents a bushel while it costs the producer who is growing the grain forty miles from the railhead 20 cents a bushel at the