

crease in freight rates to the extent of 17 per cent, do you know of any other method in which the position as was found by the Board of Transport Commissioners could be met, other than in this way?

Mr. MAGEE: I know of no other immediate way in which it could be met, Mr. Chevrier. Our thought is that—

Mr. CHEVRIER: Would you excuse me if I interrupt you there. If it does not meet the position, then how are the railways going to get the money?

Mr. MAGEE: Our position was first of all against the subsidized rate reductions of the class and commodity rates and against the freight rate freeze, and in favour of allowing continuance of competitive transportation, which we have tried to show in the submission has been bringing about great changes in the freight rate picture in the last 10 years, and, we think, favourable changes. We should let that continue.

We did say to the Minister of Transport, when we met with him in January, in connection with the coming royal commission, or what we referred to then as the national transportation inquiry—because we did not know it would be a royal commission—that we would participate in the inquiry if it was permissible, and we would cooperate in any way that we could in helping to bring about a solution to some of the problems which may have existed in the transportation field.

Mr. CHEVRIER: But the board decided against that contention. Where would the railways find themselves, if they did not have the benefit of the increase—that is what I am trying to get from you. Do you have any alternative?

Mr. MAGEE: Yes, sir. Our position is that the rail rate—

The CHAIRMAN: Pardon me a moment, we are dropping below a quorum, Mr. MAGEE, and there is a question which we have here. Is it the wish of the committee that charts, tables and graphs contained in this brief be reproduced in the committee's printed record at the point at which they appear in the brief, or would you prefer to print them in a group as an appendix? What is the feeling of the committee?

Mr. FISHER: What is the difference? Is there any relative difference in difficulty, so far as the printer is concerned?

The CHAIRMAN: Unless this is passed, they would not be printed. We have the evidence here but we do not have the charts. Where would it be preferable to have those charts put in?

Mr. DRYSDALE: As an appendix, I would think.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that they should be put in as an appendix?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you finished, Mr. Chevrier?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I did not get an answer to the question.

Mr. MAGEE: Our position is that the 17 per cent freight rate increase should have been allowed to stand. It would not have been the full 17 per cent increase. We have produced evidence here which demonstrates that it could not possibly have been the full 17 per cent increase.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Supposing it was only 10 per cent? Supposing you are correct in your assumption, and it was only 10 per cent that still means, I suppose, about \$50 million for the railways. Where are the railways going to get the \$50 million if they do not get it from the increase? They are getting \$20 million of it here. Where would they get the effect of the 10 per cent, if that is in effect what the increase amounted to?

Mr. MAGEE: They would have to come and ask for another increase; and we have shown in the brief that the rail increase in the past ten years has been only 58 per cent. We have said that the permissive increase of the board