

That is our position at this moment.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Browne asked you a question and you stated in effect that you felt that subsidization was harmful in so far as the position of the truckers is concerned. Does that mean you also feel that the bridge subsidy which was passed some years ago in the amount of \$7 million also was harmful to your position?

Mr. MAGEE: Potentially the bridge subsidy may have had its effect, but we never made any representations about the bridge subsidy. You will recall that when you introduced it this was one of the cases when the Canadian Trucking Associations were not on your doorstep. We have never taken any position pro or con in respect of the bridge subsidy.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Then how did you feel about it when in the maritimes the freight rate was changed from 20 to 30 on outgoing traffic?

Mr. MAGEE: Our feeling about the increase of the subsidization or the rate reduction to 30 per cent on the westbound interprovincial haul prompted us to make a considerable study of the whole maritime transportation situation as it involved our industry, particularly because at the same time as that subsidized rate reduction was increased the government of the day announced there would be an inquiry into the maritime transportation problems. Obviously then we had to decide what was our position in respect of the Maritime Freight Rates Act. We came to the conclusion that the Maritime Freight Rates Act, and the rate reductions under it, were not going to be removed and therefore that we would have to consider what other action could be taken to equalize the competitive conditions under the act as between rail and trucking.

As of the sixth of this month we presented a submission of the interdepartmental committee investigating the maritime transportation problem in which we asked that the Maritime Freight Rates Act be extended to include the trucking industry in the maritime provinces.

Mr. CHEVRIER: To whom was this presentation made?

Mr. MAGEE: The interdepartmental committee investigating the maritime transportation problem.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is it a federal group?

Mr. MAGEE: Yes, we sent the submission to Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. FISHER: Is that the committee Mr. Brooks is on?

Mr. MAGEE: I think so.

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): What does the trucking industry do in respect of moving agricultural products? Is it feasible to move grain by truck? Do they move any farm products at all?

Mr. MAGEE: I gave an answer to that question yesterday from the dominion bureau of statistics motor transport statistics, national estimates 1957.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): Short haul.

Mr. MAGEE: It gave a sample of the traffic which accounted for \$71,958,000 of gross revenue. I pointed out that the total gross revenue of the trucking industry for 1957 was \$380,759,000. So this is only a sample. On page 30 of this report the dominion bureau of statistics defined agricultural products in a commodity classification as flour, fruit, grain, grain products, sugar beets, vegetables and other agricultural products. We accounted for 108,848,000 net ton miles in 1957, with the average haul per ton being 598.1 miles. Of course, that is an average figure, so many of the hauls were longer and some were shorter.

The other contribution of the trucking industry in regard to the haulage of products of the farm is a figure which I did not give yesterday, which I should have given. That is animals and animal products which the dominion