

The Address—Mr. Hopkins

I might give one specific example in this regard. I believe it is an example of the arrogance of the CNR. A company in my area which is in the wood business asked for rates for the hauling of logs a distance of approximately 200 miles. That company was given a rate something in the order of 54 cents or 57 cents, which would have added some \$50 a thousand to the price of the lumber or plywood produced at the manufacturing level. This rate was questioned during a meeting which was held. The railroads came back with a rate of 27 cents. This points out very blatantly how well they did their homework in the first place. It would seem obvious that there are people in the sales division who announce a rate but who simply are not interested in obtaining that freight. It would seem there are only certain lines of freight in which they are interested.

So, what happens? In some slow growth areas, such as areas in which forestry is the basic industry, the products, in this case wood products, are kept off the trains and hence the traffic is cut back on those lines. Then, some day we will find that the railway has appeared before the Canadian Transport Commission with a sob story to the effect the line is not paying and will have to be abandoned. Such action can only produce more problems for areas of Canada which are already slow growth areas. I think Members of Parliament today, regardless of party affiliation, who come from slow growth areas should be on top of this situation every day so that we might have a policy which would be fair to these areas, and so that we might be able to operate as economically as possible in this nation. Instead of just complaining about unemployment, let us do something in this regard.

Let us put these far-reaching policies into operation in places in Ontario where the basic tax dollar will help industries and municipalities which do not have a strong economic base at the present time. At the same time, let us keep the railroads in a position where they are in fact knitting together the economy of Canada instead of simply making runs between the cities of Canada without consideration for the smaller communities in between.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that pretty well rounds out my remarks, with the exception of a few comments I have to make concerning the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The extra \$100 million that has been thrown into CMHC is a good shot in the arm and I congratulate the Minister without Portfolio for that. But again, I should like to deal with the local situation because it seems to me that when certain policies are laid down, Renfrew county appears to be a buffer zone between the northern and southern parts of the province. When policies are laid down for northern Ontario, usually they do not apply to areas just below North Bay. The towns of Deep River, Chalk River, and part of the town of Peta-wawa qualify for CMHC loans, but the town of Pembroke does not qualify at this time. However, the city of North Bay with a population of 4,800 does qualify for CMHC loans. It is somewhat ridiculous to place the town of Pembroke with a population of about 16,000 on the same policy level so far as CMHC is concerned as the city of Toronto.

[Mr. Hopkins.]

• (3:40 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Hopkins: People in the town of Pembroke do not receive CMHC loans. As I said, we suffer because we are not included in northern Ontario, but at the same time we are too far north to be included in Southern Ontario. I think it is interesting to note that the smaller communities of Mattawa, Bonfield and the lower part of Nipissing have received little or nothing from CMHC simply because an instruction has been issued by the North Bay office that the Corporation does not want to be involved with housing in smaller communities.

Approximately 175 loans have been approved for the city of North Bay, but if my information is correct, very few have been approved for the town of Mattawa. I put this on the record because I want it brought to the attention of these officials, and I will be backing it up with letters. I want this reconsidered when the new budget for CMHC comes out.

Mr. Paproski: Let your constituents write to their federal member.

Mr. Hopkins: If they write to the federal member in my area, they will get service.

As a final note, I should like to congratulate in a very serious way the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) for the serious, dignified and discreet manner in which they have carried out their duties in the last few days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, before I start my speech I should like to commend the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hopkins). I am quite sure that he is a positive person, but I noticed that even among his positive suggestions there appeared a few criticisms which, if they had come from the opposition, would likely have been referred to as negative. Anyway, I will try to be positive in my contribution to this debate, even though I am speaking from the negative side of the House.

Initially, I did not expect to take part in the debate, but a problem has come to the force in the last few days. I am referring to the chicken and egg war and the problems that have developed as a result of it. In Canada we have a Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) who, like old Macdonald, has a chick chick here and a chick chick there. At the moment he has too many chick chicks, not to mention a few too many eggs and a few too many turkeys. Not only that, but they are isolated in economic pockets in the country because they cannot cross inter-provincial boundaries. This situation results from the marketing board legislation passed by the various provinces. It is regrettable that things have come to this pass, and for this reason I wish to take part in this debate.