

port of Quebec, the United Grain Growers had to make arrangements with a vessel leaving Montreal to stop at Quebec and pick these cattle up, and I understand that it was necessary to put up a bonus of \$600 to have that vessel put in at Quebec. They have to pay the additional rate from Montreal, including insurance, and until their shipments of grain can be made from Quebec it is impossible to make up mixed carloads, and that is what we want to do. It is this discriminatory freight rate that is preventing us from using the port of Quebec. I am sorry it is so late, because I should like to quote some figures in support of my argument.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend mean that a ship would have to take grain as well as cattle to make up a carload? Is that the difficulty?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes. It is impossible for a vessel to take a straight cargo of cattle, because the vessel needs ballast and has to be loaded below with grain. The cattle are put on the decks. But if we could make up mixed shipments at Quebec, we could use that port for our cattle, but we cannot do it so long as this discriminatory freight rate is in effect. Some may say that the railways would lose money carrying our grain to Quebec at the prevailing prairie rates, but an examination of railway statistics will prove that the railways are making money handling our grain at these rates and any fair unbiased person studying the figures must admit that.

There is also another very important factor. I secured some figures a short time ago from the Canadian National showing the tonnage out of various divisional points between Winnipeg and Port Arthur on the main line of the old Canadian Northern, and also between Winnipeg and Quebec on the transcontinental. The average tonnage from Winnipeg to Port Arthur via the old main line is 2,600 tons, while the average from Winnipeg to Quebec is 3,205 tons; in other words, the same engine and train and crew can handle 25 per cent more between Winnipeg and Quebec, and yet we have a rate which is about double that applying to Port Arthur. Is there any reason for that? The minister mentioned Sir Henry Thornton as giving his approval to this expenditure. I wonder if he would give his approval to the removal of this discriminatory rate on grain. I wrote Sir Henry Thornton early in the session and asked for an interview to discuss this matter, but I have not been able to secure an interview; I do not know why. This is a very serious matter and I would strongly impress

on the government the necessity for discussing it with Sir Henry Thornton and see if something cannot be done. I am not pleading for Quebec. Many hon. members know more about it than I do, and are better qualified than I to put its claims forward, but I do say, speaking from the standpoint of the farmers of western Canada, we want to use that port, and we must use it if we are going to develop any cattle trade at all. This is the key to the whole situation. Get rid of that discriminatory rate and I will wager that inside two or three years we will be shipping three times the number of cattle to the Old Country that we are doing to-day.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am pleased at the remarks of my hon. friend from Mackenzie. There is no doubt that the shortest distance between the West and the St. Lawrence river and ocean ports from Winnipeg to Quebec over the Transcontinental, and the very arguments which my hon. friend has just brought forward were advanced years ago by the representatives of the West in the House of Commons and in the Senate. The same arguments have been advanced also by the Quebec official bodies, but there has always seemed to be somebody or something between to prevent the wishes of both Quebec and the West being realized. I sincerely hope, and I am going to do my best, so far as I am concerned, to see that justice is done in that regard.

As far as this particular item is concerned. I must say that it is rather at the request of the Shipping Federation, the big trans-Atlantic lines, including the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National, that these preliminary works are being undertaken. The accommodation at the port of Quebec needs enlarging. New shipping lines have adopted Quebec as their terminal this summer, and one shipping line has been refused accommodation because there was not space available. The tendency is for the tonnage of vessels to increase, and the larger vessels cannot go further than Quebec on the St. Lawrence river. It is the deep water port, and it is necessary for the development of the St. Lawrence that greater accommodation should be provided for the largest vessels. It cannot hurt Montreal in any way. Quebec is rather the complement of the port of Montreal, and that is what the most of the newspapers in the city of Montreal have said in that regard. The Shipping Federation is demanding that these works should be carried on. The amount will have to be determined when all the