

the history of our economic development has been such as to favour the small operator. It may indeed be that the existence of the small operator is a good thing. It is hard to say.

All these things stand in the way of my saying to you there is less or there is the same or there is more.

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): There is one other point which you made. It seems clear that the private operators seem to be a great deal more prevalent in the maritimes than, say, the for-hire operators.

Mr. MANN: I did not make that point.

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): I mean in the statistics you point out to us that this is the point that became apparent.

Mr. MANN: I said that, Mr. Browne, in the hope that I could show at least to myself, that to use the method used by Canadian Trucking Associations to measure the importance of the trucking industry in the various provinces by means of net ton miles per capita, is invalid.

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): What I wanted to bring to your attention in that regard, was do you feel that the effect of private operators would be the same as for-hire operators, they would not be in direct competition with the railways to the same extent that the for-hire would be, and that their effect might not show up on the competitive rates to the extent that a for-hire would. Therefore, it would not really be a valid comparison?

Mr. MANN: If I only had the prevalence of private carriers that these statistics indicate, I might agree with you but I do not think I have them. There is probably an explanation. It may indeed be that the net ton mile quantity is produced by the fact we have a few private carriers carrying ore. I do not know, I cannot tell.

All I am trying to do by compiling this exhibit is simply to show you cannot use that method used by the Canadian Trucking Associations to show the committee that subsidies destroy the trucking industry. That was the point of the statistics.

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): Would you not feel that if there were two forms of transport and one was getting a subsidy and the other was not, that there would be a principle there which would certainly tend towards one or the other?

Mr. MANN: It would appear to be so.

Mr. DRYSDALE: You made a certain point with considerable emphasis in your submission in regard to the non-competitive rates being an extremely high percentage. Perhaps I missed the point, but by virtue of the Maritime Freight Rates Act, 20 percent and 30 per cent, is not that just what you would expect the rates would be in competition?

Mr. MANN: No, I do not think so, sir. If that were so, then there would be no competitive rates at all and no agreed charges at all. We have a subsidy on potatoes, for instance, 30 per cent of that part of the haul which lies east of the Levis-Diamond Quebec boundary and yet there is an agreed charge on potatoes, both in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. That has been doubled, although perhaps there is some reason for a subsidy based on competitive rates.

I am just trying to clarify my own thinking. That act sets statutory rates in essence in the maritime provinces. If those rates were on a non-competitive basis back in 1927, would they not continue on that basis?

Mr. MANN: No, you can change them as conditions change.

Mr. DRYSDALE: But because of their relatively low level I guess they would not become competitive, would they?