

our brief—that any figures that we presented on the waybill analysis must not be looked upon as absolute figures.

Please remember that the waybill analysis is limited so far as we are concerned, to showing trends and comparisons; so the absolute figures, the figures we give, should not be quoted as being railway revenue per ton mile. In other words, please do not look at any of our individual figures and say to yourselves: this is the situation. The only absolute figures in our brief are the figures on table 10, because they came from Dominion Bureau of Statistics sources.

Table 1 on page 10 would be an example taken from actual railway revenue. All the rest of our tables of figures are assembled only from waybill analyses and are only of true value when looking for comparisons between them. Therefore I think that the most important table—but let me give you an example: we have a chart number 8, and we have a chart number 4.

Chart 4 gives single figures showing the burden of railway rates. Yesterday a question was handed to me relating to this. It asked whether it is a valid figure that we I have shown. I tried to indicate it was only valid in comparing like situations. So these figures are not absolute. You must not say that the Canadian trucking associations are quoting these figures as being railway revenue per ton mile.

Then we come to chart 8 near the end of the brief. This chart is useful I think because it only shows the percentage of raise and decrease. There we are only comparing like situations. We compare what happens with railway rates in one year as opposed to another, and we use the same basic assumptions. Please do not regard our figures as being absolute figures. There is only one table which is that way, and it is the first table you quoted.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): I do not accept the ton-mile comparison at all. We cannot find anywhere in the brief figures for the percentage increase on the two classes we are considering, class and commodity rates. You show the increase in percentage revenue from those two particular classes, but you do not show the percentage of increase in the actual rates. Have you got those figures?

Mr. MAGEE: We show the total rate trend of the past decade, but we do not break it down in groups. The minute you break it down in groups and proceed from there on the assumption that perhaps the subsidy should go on there, it again raises the question of why one group of shippers which has been using one form of transport in Canada should benefit by the subsidy on their traffic while shippers who use other forms of transport do not.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): It does not give a fair impression when you say that the actual increase in freight rates in Canada is only 57 per cent as compared to the maximum possible of 157, or something of that nature. We agree with the agreed charge and with competitive rates. Of course we do not feel they have gone up as much. But we, in western Canada, feel that class and commodity rates show the effect in agricultural communities particularly where we feel they have gone up to practically the full limit.

I would like to point out that this increase in competitive rates and agreed charge rates in western Canada is almost entirely payable by industrial operations in western Canada, and is not payable by agriculture at all, or if so, to a very minor degree. Therefore, the entire cost of this great increase over the past ten years in western Canada has been borne by our agricultural economy. That is a point which you do not take into consideration in your brief at all.

Mr. E. G. CHARNOCK (*Chairman of the Joint Transportation Committee of Port Arthur and Fort William*): Mr. Chairman, I am chairman of the joint transportation committee of Port Arthur and Fort William. May I ask a question?