

Supply—Transport

He can go by rail or by road. I have to travel literally hundreds of miles in my riding, and in some sections of it there are only steamship services. That is the only connection that is provided there. In order to get around and see my constituents I must pay. I have never minded that in the past. I think the principle is wrong. If a minister can go to his people by rail for nothing, then I should be able to travel on steamships, particularly on the ones that get very heavy subsidies from this house, for nothing. I should be able to go and visit my people in the same way.

Mr. Coldwell: I think probably some of us who have not this to contend with as members of parliament should rise and say something in support of the principle that is being asked for by the members of parliament who are involved. In fact, I think it might have been better if some of the rest of us who are not involved had known about this and had raised the issue, because I am quite sure that while an interpretation might have been placed upon something that was said by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano, it would not make any difference to his attitude on subsidies, or public affairs generally.

What I was going to say was this: If those of us who have not to cross water are able to travel to the House of Commons without let or hindrance in this way, no matter how small the amount—probably it does not amount to a great deal to some members relatively, but the principle is there—

Mr. Gibson: Certainly.

Mr. Coldwell:—I think some consideration might be given to the matter by the minister. I know that we cannot do anything here at the moment, but I think it is only proper that a few of us who are not personally involved in this matter should say that we think that the principle that the hon. gentleman is arguing for is a sound one and should be conceded.

Mr. Chevrier: What I was going to say when I rose a moment ago is this. The difficulty arises because of the fact that there is no body that has jurisdiction over these steamship operations, such as the one having jurisdiction over the railways. The board of transport commissioners provides the regulations governing the issuance of transportation. In this case I suppose it would be possible to meet the position with an amendment, but I certainly would not be prepared to bring down an amendment without more discussion on the matter. I think a question of that kind would have to be discussed with the

steamship companies involved. It is my feeling that if it were there would not be very much difficulty about it. Perhaps I can ask the maritime commission to give it some consideration.

While the maritime commission does not have jurisdiction over the operations of these steamship companies, yet it provides the subsidies that have already been mentioned, and I will ask the maritime commission to give it consideration to see if it is not possible, without an amendment of the Railway Act or of some act of parliament, to grant in these specific cases courtesy transportation.

Mr. Drew: I should think that what the minister has said would certainly agree with the views of the members. I am not going to add to what he has already said about his intention to take this up, but I would not wish *Hansard* at this point to carry the impression that has been left by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni in presenting his argument. It was quite unnecessary, and *Hansard* should not be left with the imputation which was directed to the hon. member for Danforth. In the first place the hon. member for Danforth is in the buildings. He was here today. The remarks to which the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has referred were made this Friday afternoon. I think the suggestion that he leaves regularly on Thursday night was gratuitous and unnecessary. But, what is more, I would point out also that the hon. member has not correctly interpreted what was said this afternoon by the hon. member for Danforth. The hon. member for Danforth said that he would be in favour of cancelling all passes, and having the transportation provided by the issue of vouchers. I rise only to correct an impression which should not stand in the way it was placed on *Hansard*.

Mr. Gibson: If I gave the impression that I was suggesting the hon. member for Danforth has not always been a distinguished member of the House of Commons then, if possible, I would wish my remarks to be deleted from *Hansard*. I have always had a high regard for the hon. member. However, it seemed to me today unfortunate that, in a case of this kind which probably did not affect him personally, he should have taken the particular view he did take. But, so far as making any derogatory remarks about the hon. member, I shall be very glad indeed to withdraw them.

Mr. Knowles: If the minister is going to take this matter up, there is one word I should like to say. I support the principle that has been raised, but it has been suggested in the discussion that one solution