

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am speaking about their principal product, grain. Is it not true that our Western farmers have the lowest freight rates in the world, without exception, for the transportation of that commodity? I do not hear a denial. No denial is possible, because what I say is true.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: We do not know all the rates.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am glad my honourable friend has said that, for I have a list of rates here. Let us see what the freight rates in other countries are, as compared with those in Canada.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Where are these figures from?

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: They are random railway statistics from "World Railway Statistics," 1936.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That is good.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Certainly it is good. I am bringing up this point because the tribunal that the Western people refuse to accept is the tribunal that has been responsible for low rates in Canada. Let us see what they are. In Canada the population per mile of line is 252, and the freight revenue per ton-mile is 95.5 cents. In the United States, where the population is so much greater than ours, the population per mile of line is 505. The freight revenue per ton-mile in that country is \$1.003.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Where is that charged?

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am talking of the freight rates per ton-mile of the United States as a whole, compared with the freight rates per ton-mile of Canada as a whole.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: May I remind the honourable gentleman that a comparison of that kind is not worth anything? You must know the facts behind the comparison. You must know the volume of trade, distances and all that sort of thing. The mere bald statement that over the whole of the United States a certain rate is charged does not mean anything comparatively.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am speaking to men who, I assume, are accustomed to dealing with statistics. My honourable friend should know that this is an ordinary, reasonable and illuminating way of treating statistics. Why? Because you take the factors that apply to rate-making. First of all you take the number of persons per mile of line. If you have twice the population per mile of line you have twice the traffic. So population is the fundamental factor. Let us see where Canada stands. Great Britain's population per mile

of line is 2,232—nearly ten times as much as Canada's; its freight revenue per ton-mile is \$2.910, or more than three times Canada's. Germany has a population per mile of line of 1,955, and its freight revenue per ton-mile is \$2.087—more than twice as much as Canada's. Italy's population per mile of line is 2,955, and its freight revenue per ton-mile is \$2.756—almost three times Canada's. France's population per mile of line is 1,547, and its freight revenue per ton-mile is \$2.306—about two and a half times Canada's. Japan's population per mile of line is 4,322; its freight revenue per ton-mile is 82.3 cents—the only exception, the freight revenue per ton-mile being lower than in Canada. The explanation is simple to anyone familiar with the scale of industrial wages in that country. Japanese labour, according to our standards, is paid but a beggarly rate. Australia's density of population per mile of line is 250, about the same as Canada's, but there the freight revenue per ton-mile is \$2.512—nearly three times Canada's. The figures for Brazil show a very high ratio of revenue to population, the population per mile of line being 2,135, with a freight revenue per ton-mile of \$11.680. Argentine's population per mile of line is 520, about twice ours, and its freight revenue per ton-mile is \$2.410—nearly three times as much as ours.

The fundamental principle of this Bill is regulation. I cannot help thinking that if we brought together the best informed men of this country and confronted them with our present dilemma, regulation or survival of the fittest—dog eat dog—they would have no hesitation in advising us: "The progressive course to take, if you wish to eliminate frightful waste and place your transportation industry on an even keel, is to adopt the principle of regulation." This Bill has been very materially amended and is to a large extent the Bill of this House. If we give it third reading it will have to run the gauntlet in the lower House. There it may be still further improved. The principle it embodies, we cannot forget, is essential in our day if we are to have the progress that goes with civilization. Therefore, thinking as I do, I must support the motion for third reading.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Will the honourable gentleman allow me a question with regard to world rates on wheat?

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: It was on general freight.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I thought the honourable gentleman was speaking of wheat.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I did so at first.