Railway Act

Then there is the final conclusion:

This is all that can usefully be recommended in regard to this much debated question of transcontinental rates and their relation to rates at intermediate points.

The royal commission has gone to so much trouble to investigate this problem, and has come to the conclusion that settling these transcontinental rates at one and one-third should be the proper solution in view of the fact that it will assist all the provinces east of the Pacific coast. The maritimes have a problem. I quite appreciate the maritime position in this respect, and we go along with them in stating that their difficulties should be solved. We agree that they should maintain maritime freight rates, and in the committee the legislation was amended in order to ensure that there shall be no interference with their preferred position in the rate structure.

The big question facing western Canada is, are we going to continue to be a mere market for British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec or are we going to be allowed to industrialize our province in the manner in which it can and should be developed? Or are we to be allowed to industrialize our province in the manner in which we can and should develop it? Surely no one would say, when we speak from a national point of view-and that is the point of view we should have in this parliament-that any part of Canada should be retarded in its industrial progress. Certainly no province should stand up in this House of Commons and claim that any part of Canada, no matter where it be, should be retarded in its industrial growth just in order to give an unfair advantage to some other section of the country. No one can criticize us in Alberta for ever saying that we would not carry our full share of any costs which were involved in helping Canada as a whole. When we rise in this House of Commons and declare that we are entitled to justice, no one should criticize us. I would point out that this bill does not do away with the gross and unjust discrimination that has existed for the province of Alberta for the last forty years. No, it does not do that, and let no one get that idea into his head. Even under this bill we in the province of Alberta are paying one-third higher rates than any other part of Canada, at least any part on the transcontinental line. No, Mr. Chairman, we are not getting anything for nothing. Yet some hon. members have the audacity to stand up here and say: You should wipe out the one and one-third rule. Would they not make a great national party?

Mr. Brooks: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should rise on a point of order. I was on [Mr. Johnston.]

this committee. The hon, member has stated a number of times that the Conservative party members on that committee voted with British Columbia as opposed to Alberta.

Mr. Johnston: I did not say anything about your vote.

Mr. Brooks: You said that we opposed Alberta. You said that time and time again.

Mr. Johnston: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Brooks: I want to say that I did not oppose Alberta. I opposed it neither by voice nor vote. I may say that my sympathies were more with Alberta than with British Columbia in this matter. My opinion is that my hon. friend is simply trying to run the Calgary by-election here in this chamber tonight.

Mr. Johnston: Now we are getting into elections, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Brooks: Yes. That is exactly what you have been doing.

Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood): We have been there for some time.

Mr. Johnston: May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that I have not been out to Calgary; but the leader of the opposition was out there and took part in the election campaign, as well as some other members.

An hon. Member: You are taking part here.

Mr. Johnston: I recall what I would call some political speeches before the leader of the opposition went west. I can tell you quite candidly, Mr. Chairman, that I am not thinking of any by-election in Calgary.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Johnston: What is one member here or there, compared with the passage of this measure?

Mr. Brooks: Let the hon. member stick to the facts when he is making statements.

Mr. Johnston: Why did you not rise in the committee and give your approval to this section when your colleagues were lambasting it right and left?

Mr. Brooks: There was not much chance for me to do that, as you were talking most of the time.

Mr. Johnston: I am not going to argue about that. I think I had a right to talk, because it was Alberta's interests that were at stake.

Mr. Brooks: Exactly.