

The gentleman who will be appearing here tomorrow morning is an expert in the matter of freight rates.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of whether or not we will hear your witness, it is a question of whether or not his expenses will be paid.

Mr. BADANAI: It would seem only fair that we do pay them.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a motion before us. Those in favour of this motion by Mr. Fisher, so signify.

Motion negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: We have a brief here by Mr. W. A. Wallace, the general manager of—

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask Mr. Knowles one or two questions? I would like to try to clear up a few points.

Mr. BELL (*Saint John-Albert*): I do not object to that but I do feel that Mr. McPhillips has made a very good point. Obviously this is important and undoubtedly it is very interesting and I am wondering whether we should not hear these briefs of the various trucking associations now and then recall Mr. Knowles. Perhaps it is only my personal thought, but I can see where Mr. Knowles would have the stand most of the afternoon. We could then get the briefs in and for those of us who do not understand the freight rates, we would have to recall Mr. Knowles. That is my objection. I am not speaking on it but it would seem to be a more reasonable approach.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It does not mean that Mr. Knowles would have to be here all afternoon because I was only going to ask two or three questions.

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): The question arose because each member might want to ask two or three more questions.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If they wish why should they not be allowed to ask even five or ten questions? Let us get this straight.

The CHAIRMAN: We are still on the first item.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is the point. If we are not going to be able to ask questions, let me know. I have a lot to do and would be able to do it.

Mr. BELL (*Saint John-Albert*): You are the one who started to object.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Certainly, but my objection was to the committee meeting while the house is in session. However, now that we are meeting I would like to proceed and ask my question; I would like an explanation.

Mr. FISHER: It seems to me to be going beyond the scope and I am a little disturbed. I understood from the minister's statement in the house that the purpose of this committee was to give us an opportunity to go in detail into the matter of freight rates. This is not a hearing of the board of transport commissioners, it is the railways committee. It is an investigation to determine how the question of subsidies will affect the rail freight rate structure. If we are going to have Mr. McPhillips' interpretation of this, it can be automatically checked. I will be very disappointed if that is the aim of the committee. I would like a statement from the minister as to how far he thinks we are entitled to go into this particular thing.

I certainly agree with Mr. McPhillips' point of view because we do feel very strong about it.

Mr. HEES: As far as I am concerned any member who wishes to ask any questions is perfectly entitled to do so.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I go ahead then? Mr. Knowles, this morning you were good enough to give us a breakdown of percentages in so far as the application of the subsidy is concerned to the western, central and maritime regions. I was particularly interested in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec—that is the