

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

● (10:00 p.m.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, am I safe in predicting that tomorrow we will continue with the study of Bill C-231?

Mr. Knowles: Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Yes, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the study of that bill.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—ALLEGED TAMPERING WITH MAIL BY HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the other day by way of a question I raised the matter of the activities of the Hudson's Bay Company in handling or mishandling the mail in a certain instance, and subsequently sent photostat copies of the documents I had in my possession to both the Postmaster General (Mr. Côté) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell). The contents of them were also widely publicized because of the intense interest that exists in the matter.

I realize that the Postmaster General may not yet have had an opportunity to inquire fully into that and other matters which were the subject of R.C.M.P. investigation, and thus may not be in a position this evening to indicate fully what course the government is taking. However, following my question in the house the Hudson's Bay Company issued a statement, presumably in Winnipeg.

Although I inquired, I have not been able to obtain a copy of that statement, but I do have with me the references to it which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* of Friday, January 13. One of the sentences published by the newspaper relating to the statement was as follows:

The H. B. C. statement said Mr. Howard appears to have based his charges on a single incident at Fort Chippewyan, Alta., in November, 1965, which has long since been resolved to the satisfaction of both the post office and the complainant.

The interesting aspect of that is that at the outset the Hudson's Bay Company admits its culpability. At the outset it admits there was such an instance and passes it off as being of no consequence because it happened some

it. I am not far removed from a municipality whose potential is not yet fully utilized. There is land there which is still being broken up, land which will produce more grain. Yet no account will be taken of this. We do not realize what fertilizer will do for that country. We do not know what another freight rate will do. Will it stunt the growth of that country? We opened up the best land. We went where we thought the best grain could be produced. From that point on, we had to move into other areas. As the fertilizer became available, new areas were brought under cultivation.

After the war, when machines became available, they broke up that land, and as we were able to absorb the cost, we did it. But if you alter the Crowsnest pass agreement, if we have to pay the full freight rate and on top of that if everything we ship in must travel at the higher rate and everything we ship out must go at the higher rate, I believe we know where to go. I have heard this before under a Liberal government: Join the United States side. Do not think for one moment that this idea cannot be circulated again, and it might be, unless we are prepared to see that this transport is for east and west, for all Canada. This must be a bill for Canada rather than a bill for certain sections, rather than a bill for certain companies.

It is easy for us to ship some of our finished products into the United States, and we may have a ready market. In the past I have asked the president of Massey-Ferguson why they did not set up a plant right in the middle of the west. That is another subject. The point is this: The minister must realize that if this is allowed to happen certain things will come to Canada which I am sure he will not be interested in.

There is a different type of disunity in Canada. There is a certain group which would like to disunite for a different reason. We should not give them that opportunity.

Mr. Rapp: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder whether there would be any disposition to complete this clause tonight.

An hon. Member: If you remove the clause.

Mr. Pickersgill: Of course that is quite impossible.

Progress reported.