

that is that the rates in Ontario and in Quebec are not as high as they should be because the railways feel they cannot charge the proper rates in those provinces because of trucking competition. Now it may be that the western provinces may complain and say that a competitive rate which the railway is proposing to file is too low, that they should not be allowed to file such a competitive rate, and there you get right into the question which has to do with the railways. I do not see how any representative here can make a proper submission when he is being compelled to restrict his statements to one particular section or one particular subsection before he has had a chance to lay the groundwork. Now I am inclined to be a bit hostile, as a western member, but I think there should be a fair hearing and I do not believe we are going to get a fair hearing if the chairman is going to keep on trying to force the witness to confine his remarks to a particular section or subsection before we have got the story. I have been kicked around like that in court myself more than once, and it makes it absolutely impossible for counsel to make a presentation. We are a semi-judicial body and we should allow the witnesses to state their case and not go after them in the middle of a sentence and ask them to go on with something else. Mr. Evans has his brief prepared. Why not let him present it and then when we have heard him we can sift out what we think is the grain from the chaff. I think, Mr. Chairman, you are interrupting too much, that we would make faster progress if we heard the submission, but as it is now are just being jumped from one point to another and not getting anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Green, I am only trying to keep the inquiry of this committee within the scope of the reference, and if I have been unreasonable in trying to do that, I know the committee will very soon set me right. I will certainly not let this inquiry become wide open and be a court of appeal on the report of the royal commission without plenty of protest from the chair. The witness is an experienced counsel and I do not think he will be put out of his stride at all. If you have any complaints of the interruptions I wish you would please make them from time to time, Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, sir.

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with the chairman. The witness admitted he was before the Royal Commission on Transportation for 135 days and arising out of all of their deliberations there comes this bill. It is not our prerogative to go back over the ground and examine why the commission made the recommendations they did or why the government brought this bill in. What I would like to hear the witness do is to examine that bill section by section and tell us what should replace it. I believe that if he did that it would be more informative to the committee. We would actually know then what he wants. I do not think we are authorized to make a rehash of the evidence that brought about this bill. I would like to find out what their objections are to this bill and what should replace it.

Mr. LAING: Mr. Chairman, could Mr. Evans tell us what proportion of his company's freight moves under competitive rates and what proportion of revenue they get from it?

Mr. EVANS: Approximately ten per cent of revenue.

Mr. LAING: And the volume?

Mr. EVANS: I am not too sure on that, but revenue is ten per cent. Volume would be slightly higher. The average return per ton of competitive traffic is very much higher than the average of all traffic.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreeable then that we shall leave it to the witness to object if he is interrupted too much?

Agreed.