

with the details of it, corrections could be made in committee. I am convinced the spirit behind it is right. We need it; for many years in British Columbia we have waited for it. We have found out what is necessary, and we will not be satisfied until we get justice.

Mr. W. J. LOUCKS (Rosetown): Mr. Speaker, I notice that on March 7, 1932, there was a discussion concerning domestic freight rates on grain and grain products, and on that occasion I spoke. I believe I said something to this effect, that I wished the bill then before us had gone farther and taken in gasoline, and some other commodities I mentioned. I was referring more particularly to the commodities entering our province from Alberta. Upon that occasion I quoted rates to Delisle. I do not wish to criticize the previous speaker, but it seems to me he has been very critical of the concessions which have already been given. Probably those concessions have been obtained through the efforts of hon. members on this side of the house, along with those of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) who took a very active part in the debate. Upon that occasion I did support the hon. member, and intimated that I was not satisfied with it because it helped only the province of British Columbia. So far as we were concerned, there was nothing coming back. After the explanation given by the Minister of Railways and the fact that the representatives of the four western provinces met in Ottawa during the recess, I cannot help but think that the provinces were intelligently represented. I take it that they came to a satisfactory understanding, and so far as grains coming into British Columbia from the prairie provinces are concerned I believe a fair and reasonable adjustment was made.

The hon. member who has just spoken has mentioned a very excessive rate. I am not saying he is not right. But on the other hand I am convinced more firmly than I was a year ago that our export rate is probably the lowest in the world. I know whereof I speak when I say that our rates are lower than those of the country to the south of us. When in Montana some time ago I had an opportunity to check up, I found that the rate from Big Sandy to Minneapolis, a distance of about 1,000 miles, was 41 cents a hundredweight, whereas the rate from Delisle to Fort William, a similar distance, was only 22 cents, or only about half.

My impression is that if we press too far in the matter of domestic freight rates in

times like these, when we are facing large deficits, there is only one alternative open to the managers of the railroad. If we insist upon a further reduction in domestic rates, they will increase the export rates. I think people in Saskatchewan and hon. members from that province in the house would rather leave the export rate alone than have it suffer for the benefit of the domestic rate. If we press unduly at this time that is probably what would occur. I wish to assure the hon. member for New Westminster that at a later date he will have my support, at a time when the management of the roads can show us that they have eliminated the deficits. We might take further action when the time comes—and I believe it will come—when these deficits shall have been eliminated.

One further observation: I notice that in the bill there is an intimation that power will be taken from the government. The hon. member who has just taken his seat referred to the opportunity we have of appealing through the Minister of Railways. If I interpret the bill correctly, upon its passage that opportunity will be eliminated. At the present time it is not. We can discuss it in the house; we have a say in it; influence can be brought to bear upon the management of the road. But in the measure before us that influence will be eliminated. I cannot quite understand the hon. member, because when the railroad measure was up only a short time ago he opposed it because it was taking control away from the government. To my mind that is the very thing he is doing in this bill—taking control away from the government. So far as British Columbia is concerned, I believe they should be satisfied with the adjustment that has been made. If there is any grievance it should come from the prairie provinces.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has already spoken on the bill; he cannot speak twice.

Mr. LOUCKS: I am sorry if I am out of order. I might say, however, I was on my feet when the hon. member got up.

Mr. NEILL: No; I waited for the hon. member.

Mr. LOUCKS: I got up, but you did not see me. However I am satisfied to take my seat.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, it may be that I shall be called upon to vote on this bill, and before doing so I should like to say a few words. I have always been in sympathy with the removal of the