

Transportation

Order No. 96300 of the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada dated November 17th, 1958, and that is not a railway company, and may recommend payment to any such transportation company in respect of such year of an amount based on the position of such transportation company in relation to railway companies under that order."

I think this amendment does exactly what the hon. gentleman wanted to do. If we can do it in this way we will not require further debate on another occasion.

Mr. Gordon: I so move.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the proposer of the amendment whether he has told the Mercantile Bank of the implications of this amendment?

[Translation]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I repeat that we did not get a French copy of the amendment and I think the minister should make one available to us. Before the amendment carries, I should like to read it.

[English]

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether the translators have had sufficient time yet to prepare a French version. This amendment was concocted this afternoon, and "concocted" is perhaps the right word. I know the Law Clerk is working on it, and if the hon. member would like to have the amendment stood until we can get a translation prepared, I would be quite agreeable.

[Translation]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, could that section stand until we have received a French copy.

I should now like to ask the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) some explanation on the following point: unless I am mistaken, we are dealing here with subsidies for transportation by companies other than railway, but which are directly related to the railway companies.

I have here a table giving the comparative rates in Toronto and in Montreal. These do not include the cost of railway transportation. They are the rates applied for delivery by the railway company trucks in Montreal and Toronto, anywhere within the city of Montreal and likewise in Toronto. We are therefore dealing with the comparative cost of delivering goods from the station in Montreal to any point within the city, and delivery

of goods taken at the station in Toronto for delivery anywhere in that city.

Here are the figures. Perhaps the minister can enlighten us in this connection. I am told that in Montreal the minimum charge is \$1.39 while in Toronto it is only 89 cents regardless of the parcel involved; that it costs 49 cents per 100 lbs. up to 2,600 lbs., or \$12.74 for 2,600 lbs., while in Toronto the rate is 22 cents per 100 lbs., or \$5.72 for 2,600 lbs. Therefore, a difference exists between Montreal and Toronto, though the same work is involved. In Toronto, it costs \$5.72; in Montreal, \$12.74, and this merely to truck goods from a freight car to a point within the city limits, as is the case in Toronto. When 16,000 lbs. or more are involved, we note that the rate is 27 cents in Montreal and 22 cents in Toronto.

Therefore, different rates are charged for exactly the same work. Why is this? I should like to know. Do the subsidies granted Toronto allow customers there to be charged 22 cents while those granted Montreal make it necessary to ask for 49 cents for 100 lbs.? If so, changes should be made in the present amendment. True, I naturally do not know all the relevant details, but at first glance and according to the figures we have been given, the handling costs of goods between the freight or express unloading yards and the consignees within the limits of these cities is higher in Montreal than in Toronto, although in both cases the rate is charged by the C.N.R. There must surely be a reason for this, and I would ask the hon. minister to inform us why handling costs are higher in Montreal than in Toronto when labour costs are the same.

[English]

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any exception to the fact that the question that the hon. gentleman asked has not very much relation to this very narrow amendment moved by the Minister without Portfolio from Toronto. However, if it is at all possible to get the information to answer his question, I undertake to get it before we complete clause 1. If that is not possible I would be glad to give it on third reading. I know the question has been listened to most carefully and I hope to be able to get the information.

[Translation]

Mr. Grégoire: On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, I thought this could be directly related and I was waiting to make my remarks on clause 1 of the bill. But I did feel that under the amendment I have here, in English at