

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

• (10:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT—TROIS-RIVIÈRES—PROTESTS
RESPECTING INCREASE IN
RAILWAY TOLLS

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion to make to the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac, in order to prove to the government that what we have said has not been done in order to create obstruction. If the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac has an amendment to move on section 11, and to that section only, he might agree to have the other sections on which there is no amendment passed, and tomorrow, we could come back to section 11?

[*English*]

The Chairman: Is it agreed that clause 11 shall stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause stands.

Clauses 12 to 20 inclusive agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 11 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, I also have an amendment to move to the preamble of the bill, because the preamble of the bill was removed in 1954. In my opinion, a bill of this sort should have a preamble to explain the general meaning of the bill.

Therefore I should like to move an amendment to the preamble of the bill.

[*English*]

The Chairman: It being ten o'clock, shall I rise and report progress?

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Rapp: Mr. Speaker, what will the business be for tomorrow?

Mr. Pennell: It is proposed to continue with item No. 63, the Bank of Canada Act amendments, to be followed by item No. 74, the Bank Act, and item No. 75, the Quebec Savings Banks Act.

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I asked the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) if he had received a telegram from the operators of our grain elevators and from the municipal council of Trois-Rivières objecting to the increase in fees on the St. Lawrence seaway and the Welland canal.

The minister said he had received no telegram. I understood why, a few minutes later, because while questions were being asked here, which, to my mind, were not important, I took time off to go through the papers and I realized that the minister had just stated that there would be no increase.

So I immediately called those people, my municipal council and the directors to tell them: If the telegram has not gone, do not bother sending it because it seems that the problem is settled. I have here the telegram, the original telegram reporting that the municipal council of Trois-Rivières strongly objected to the increase in fees on the seaway as likely to be detrimental to the economy of the whole Trois-Rivières area.

But I would nevertheless like to take this opportunity—and I thank the minister for his intervention to prevent such an increase in fee—with your consent, since I realize I am stretching the rules, if ever so slightly, to remind the minister that the grain elevators of Trois-Rivières are faced with a difficult problem which I would not want to explain all over again since I have already spoken of it. I should simply like to ask the minister whether he could not unofficially and for the good of the economy of the whole area served by the grain elevators to ask the responsible officials of the National Harbours Board to call, again to discuss the matter, an informal meeting with the mayor of Trois-Rivières, the representative of the grain elevators, the federal member for Trois-Rivières and the provincial member for Trois-Rivières, because there is a question of taxes, as the minister is aware, that concerns the provincial area.

I believe that if we could gather around a table these people whom I call men of good will, to talk together, we might find a compromise to a difficult problem which endangers the very existence of our grain elevators, something which would seriously affect the