

## Supply—Transport

am informed however that does not entitle a member to free transportation upon the Pacific Great Eastern.

Let me make it clear at once that they have never placed the slightest difficulty in my way when travelling on that line on a passenger train, or using their freight facilities, in conformity with the regulations existing in that regard. However I understand that there is some peculiar local position affecting the Pacific Great Eastern to the end that that railway, not having been completed, it is not a railway within the definition of the point we are discussing.

Perhaps when the minister is making a general investigation of the matter he would look into this point, because there are certain portions of my riding I can reach only by using the Pacific Great Eastern.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I will do that.

**Mr. Hansell:** Perhaps some word might be added from this corner of the house. I do not think I have been particularly backward at any time in past years in rising to support the rights of members of parliament. Predictions have been made at times that when I did so I would get it in the neck. I never have found that to be so.

It is my personal view that the same privileges granted to members of parliament on railways should be granted to them on steamships plying in Canadian waters between coastal ports. My reason for saying that is that it will be discovered in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms—and I am not raising a point of order—that a member of parliament represents not only his own constituency, but rather that he represents all the people in Canada.

I think that principle is behind the fact that there is written into the Railway Act the matter of transportation over any Canadian railway for members of parliament. How is one to get first-hand knowledge of the country if he cannot go everywhere? How can one get first-hand knowledge of those parts of the country served by steamships? I believe that all members of parliament should be given passes on all steamship lines plying Canadian waters, both inland and coastal.

The railway trains and the steamships are being run anyway, whether a member is travelling on them or not. To take a member on board a railway or a steamship does not mean even an infinitesimal cost because the railroad or steamship do not supply berths and meals and therefore it is impossible for them to lose. I make these remarks because I believe we have a right as members of

parliament representing the people of Canada to be able to travel anywhere we desire.

**Mr. McLure:** I understood the minister was going to have this matter investigated by the commissioners, but I would say that it is not necessary to have any investigation with regard to the Borden-Tormentine car ferry, or any other car ferry, because our passes are good.

**Mr. Gibson:** If it is subsidized and maintained at a loss by the Canadian government, everybody should travel free. If it is making money, then we cannot travel.

Item agreed to.

## Hudson Bay Railway—

491. To provide for the difference between the expenditures for operation and maintenance, and revenue accruing from operation during the year ending March 31, 1952, not exceeding \$250,000.

**Mr. Knight:** Mr. Chairman, last night I spoke for some thirty minutes on this particular question, but there is something else I should like to say. It would be better if I could have had both speeches together in the same *Hansard*. I should like to point out one disadvantage faced by the Hudson Bay railway as compared with other railroads. I refer to the diversion charge made by the elevator companies. I remember I was asked once to give a definition of this diversion charge and I said it was a charge for services not rendered. I think that is an apt definition.

This diversion charge of one and a half cents per bushel on wheat is made by the elevator companies when they are asked by the shipper to send his grain to a port at which that particular elevator company has no terminal. The minister can correct me if that is the wrong definition. Can he show any justification for such a charge?

This amounts to a grievance with the people who ship through Churchill. Would it make any difference in regard to this diversion charge if Churchill was given the same status—I presume it would have to be done by legislation—as other ports like Vancouver or Montreal? People do not mind paying money, but they do not like to pay it when they receive nothing in return.

As the hon. minister knows, for the past five years or so I have interested myself in the Churchill route. I was able to compliment the minister last night as well as the other organizations concerned upon the success that has been achieved in the promotion of this port. We have been able to influence public opinion, perhaps even in this house, in favour of this route. Things are coming