

Railway Act

bill was introduced on April 12; it was called for first reading on April 15 and had come up for second reading on April 22 when the hon. member spoke and said he had not the bill before him. What is in the bill that requires such a lot of interpretation? The second clause is so simple that any backwoods man could understand its meaning. It reads in part:

—and to all such traffic moving westwardly from Fort William and from all points on all lines of railway west of Fort William, to Vancouver, British Columbia and to ports on the Pacific coast.

Surely it would not take a great deal of time to discover that all we are asking for is the same freight rates to British Columbia on domestic grain as are paid by the people in the east on grain from the prairie provinces to Fort William, Quebec, Montreal or Nova Scotia.

I repeat that I am disappointed in the attitude taken by hon. members, especially those from British Columbia. I can recall their advocating such a measure in the past, but it seems that when the test comes they do not feel like coming through. The hon. member for Fraser Valley comes from a poultry district, and he knows that the people in British Columbia have been clamouring for this relief for years. Perhaps he was too busy delving back to the year 1925 to find out what was said in those days, but I am more interested in the conditions applying to-day and which will apply in the future. I introduced this bill because I believed that this was the time to show that we really wanted what we were asking for. Because of the decision of the supreme court I do not believe that British Columbia will be able to get any satisfaction from the Board of Railway Commissioners. I commend the bill to the house.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Reid) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Beaubien,	Gardiner,
Bothwell,	Garland (Bow River),
Boulanger,	Gershaw,
Brown,	Hall,
Carmichael,	Hanson (Skeena),
Casgrain,	Heenan,
Cayley,	Hepburn,
Coote,	Kennedy
Denis,	(Peace River),
Deslauriers,	Loucks,
Desrochers,	Lucas,
Donnelly,	Luchkovich,
Duff,	MacInnis,
Dumaine,	MacLean,
Factor,	McMillan
Fafard,	(Huron South),

[Mr. Reid.]

Neill,
Perras,
Reid,
Roberge,
Sanderson,
Séguin,
Speakman,
Spencer,

Stewart
(Edmonton West),
Thauvette,
Vallance,
Verville,
Weir
(Macdonald).—43.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto- High Park),	Plunkett,
Anderson (Halton),	Porteous,
Arsenault,	Price,
Arthurs,	Quinn,
Baribeau,	Rogers,
Belec,	Sauvé,
Bourgeois,	Senn,
Bowman,	Shaver,
Boyes,	Short,
Cowan (Long Lake),	Simpson
Dickie,	(Simcoe North),
Dorion,	Simpson
Duranleau,	(Algoma West),
Embury,	Smith
Esling,	(Victoria-Carleton),
Fortin,	Smith
Fraser (Cariboo).	(Cumberland),
Gagnon,	Smoke,
Ganong,	Spankie,
Gobeil,	Spotton,
Gordon,	Sproule,
Hackett,	Stanley,
Hay,	Stewart (Leeds),
Heaps,	Stewart (Lethbridge),
Johnstone,	Stirling,
Larue,	Stitt (Nelson),
Lawson,	Stitt (Selkirk),
MacNicol,	Sutherland,
McGillis,	Tétreault,
McGregor,	Thompson
McLure,	(Simcoe East),
Manion,	Thompson (Lanark),
Moore (Chateauguay- Huntingdon),	Weese,
Murphy,	White (London),
Myers,	White (Mount Royal),
Peck,	Willis,
Pickel,	Wilson,
	Wright.—70.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I was paired with the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. MacMillan). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. YOUNG: I was paired with the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Maloney). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. McGIBBON: I was paired with the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. GOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kent, Ontario (Mr. Rutherford). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. VENIOT: I was paired with the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.