

Alberta might get a better rate than Winnipeg. It may be shocking to Winnipeggers that Alberta should enjoy a better freight rate than Winnipeg, but if this does happen it will be the first time.

It has been stated that the Crowsnest Pass rate, which gives us cheap rates on our grain, makes up for the high rates we pay on other commodities; but Saskatchewan and Manitoba enjoy the advantage of the Crowsnest Pass rate, which is for all the western provinces, and is of equal value to Winnipeg as to Calgary. The freight rate under the Crowsnest Pass Agreement is 26 cents per one hundred pounds from Calgary, and 14 cents per one hundred pounds from Winnipeg. In other words, it costs us just about double the amount per bushel to ship grain to Fort William from Calgary that it costs from Winnipeg. They have an advantage over us there, but I do not see how that can be helped.

Hon. Mr. Haig: How many miles is it from Calgary to the waterfront?

Hon. Mr. Stambaugh: About 1,200 miles.

Hon. Mr. Haig: And Winnipeg is about 400 miles.

Hon. Mr. Stambaugh: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Well, we ought to get a cheaper rate?

Hon. Mr. Stambaugh: Well, you have it. You get a rate of 14 cents.

Hon. Mr. Quinn: It is proportionately cheaper from Calgary.

Hon. Mr. Stambaugh: Winnipeg ships its grain for half the price it costs us to ship ours. It seems to me that the Winnipeggers want to get it both ways.

Mention has been made of our natural resources in Alberta and what a rich province we are; but the benefits from these natural resources are not enjoyed very much by the average Albertan. In the first place, the federal government gave about half of these natural resources to the C.P.R. to help that company build a railroad, not just to serve Alberta but so as to create a transcontinental railroad to British Columbia. As I say, the C.P.R. was given nearly one-half of the richest land in Alberta, including the natural resources. Today the C.P.R. is getting millions of dollars in revenue from those natural resources, and that revenue is not going back into the railroad to reduce our freight rates. Recently the provincial government turned over practically the other half of the available natural resources to American oil companies, all of which means that the individual person in Alberta is not rich. You might say that the C.P.R. has already received one-half of our birthright. Surely no one

could begrudge us this one and one-third rate on the transcontinental freight rates.

So I say that we should kill this amendment and leave the rate as recommended by the royal commission, and I am going to move that the amendment before us be not concurred in.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Mr. Chairman, is this a proper amendment? Surely the usual procedure is just to vote in favour of or against the amendment when the question is put.

Hon. Mr. Hugessen: I think that is correct. I do not think the amendment offered just now is necessary. All the honourable senator from Bruce (Mr. Stambaugh) has to do is to vote against my motion.

The Hon. the Chairman: I was just about to rule that this amendment is out of order.

Hon. Thomas Vien: Honourable senators, during the course of this discussion the remark has been made that transcontinental competitive rates are iniquitous. In my opinion, transcontinental rates may perhaps be anomalous but they are certainly not iniquitous.

Why do the railways publish transcontinental competitive rates on shipments to Pacific or Atlantic points of destination? The reason is that if they did not do so the traffic would go to water carriers or to other railroads. Transcontinental rates are lower than rates applicable to similar goods consigned to intermediate points. That may seem anomalous at first sight.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Is it necessary for the railways to give these transcontinental rates?

Hon. Mr. Vien: Yes, it is. If they did not do so traffic would go to their competitors—water carriers via the Panama Canal, or other Canadian or American rail carriers. If that happened, what advantage would people at intermediate points derive from such a condition?

Hon. Mr. MacKinnon: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? Did anyone say that the transcontinental rates were iniquitous?

Hon. Mr. Vien: I understood the honourable gentleman from Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar) to say that the transcontinental rates had resulted in iniquity.

Hon. Mr. MacKinnon: I did not hear him say that.

Hon. Mr. Vien: I thought I understood him correctly.

Hon. Mr. Campbell: I think he said "inequity".

Hon. Mr. MacKinnon: Yes, "inequity", not "iniquity".