

*Transportation*

The National Farmers' Union said in its brief:

We recommend, therefore, that net revenues to the C.P.R. in the movement of export grain under the terms of the Crowsnest pass rates agreement be considered in the light of revenues annually accruing to the C.P.R. from related concessions and land grants and the movement of other commodities.

I believe that last phrase about other commodities was a correction to this brief, and it supports my argument about giving consideration to the very large grants made to the C.P.R.

The Saskatchewan government also presented a brief. It is a Liberal government. I have criticized its brief previously and I voice that criticism again. I believe it said that the federal government should go ahead with this bill and it raised no public objection to it. The Liberal party of Manitoba also submitted a brief, I believe some time in November, in which it said:

If there were any suggestions that such a study—

Again referring to the study within the three years.

—could lead to cancellation of Crowsnest rates then the Liberal party of Manitoba would oppose any such move with all the resources at its command.

I remember the discussion on that brief and that the people who presented it were just as concerned as most western members about possible damage to the statutory agreement.

The Canadian Federation of Agriculture had this to say:

First, it is unacceptable that there should be provision for subsidy attributable to the movement of grain under the statutory Crowsnest pass rates. We are convinced by careful study that these rates are compensatory, properly considered. In any case they form a basic plank of national economic policy in this country from which the railways and the country have profited and still profit, as well as the farmers. There is therefore no excuse, in our very strongly held opinion, for legislative provisions which run the risk of attributing an alleged transportation "subsidy" to the western grain grower. Such a procedure attaches a stigma of farm subsidy to the Crowsnest rates which is completely uncalled for.

That strongly backs up what was said a few moments ago by the hon. member for Jasper-Edson in answer to the suggestion that there is a need for a subsidy.

23033—753½

On October 18 last Canadian Co-operative Wheat Producers Limited presented a brief to the standing committee in which it said:

The Question of the Crowsnest Pass Statutory and Related Grain Rates

The position of the wheat pools on this question is in no doubt among ourselves or among any members of the Canadian parliament. Our position is that we strongly support the principle of maintaining the Crowsnest pass statutory rates as an instrument of national policy under the control of parliament.

That was part of the argument in which we have been engaged regarding the control of parliament over any decision by the new commission with respect to these rates. These views that I have put on record have proved the point I am trying to make.

• (6:30 p.m.)

I referred previously to the proposal for an inquiry to be held within three years into the revenues and expenses connected with the transport of our western grain. I think that any commission which is set up should not be in too great a hurry with regard to making this revenue and expense inquiry because, as others have mentioned, the handling and transportation of grain is something which is changing very rapidly. Within the next few years there will be even greater changes. I certainly think that if this inquiry were postponed for more than three or four years, until the whole transportation system is worked out, there would then be available a better picture of what the operations will be in the years to come.

Supporting the argument concerning changes, I have here a picture from the *Western Producer*. The picture shows two very large diesel locomotives and the accompanying text states that—

—these two 3,000 horsepower diesel locomotives are among 32 the C.P.R. has ordered for delivery this year.

The reference is to the year 1966.

In a mountain test, the two units hauled 90,000 bushels of Alberta wheat from Calgary to Revelstoke, showing a 60 per cent greater capacity than locomotives now in use. Previously, they had moved 63 cars from Medicine Hat to Calgary in three hours and 30 minutes, just nine minutes more than the schedule of the C.P.R.'s crack passenger train, *The Canadian*.

With these very much larger diesel locomotives hauling 90,000 bushels of wheat in one haul, I certainly think the expenses of the railway will be cut down. Another report here states that in 1966 the C.N.R. delivered a total of 138,500 cars carrying some 277 million