

Mr. V. M. STECHISHIN (*Manager, Manitoba Transportation Commission*): I think you are talking about shipping in the reverse direction?

Mr. McPHILLIPS: You ship some commodity, we will say, from Winnipeg to Toronto. Is the rate higher than shipping the same thing from Toronto to Winnipeg?

Mr. STECHISHIN: It would vary with the commodity. They are very rarely the same, except on class-rated goods. Grain, of course, will ship cheaper into Toronto than they can ship grain from Toronto to Winnipeg. On the other hand, there are certain articles that cost more to ship from Toronto to Winnipeg than it does from Winnipeg to Toronto. There is no relationship between the two, except on straight class-rated goods where the rate is the same in both cases.

In most cases the rates would vary.

Mr. McPHILLIPS: In most cases it would cost more?

Mr. STECHISHIN: It would depend again on the commodity. If the commodity was grain you would probably pay less going out than coming in, but if you have manufactured articles you would probably pay more coming in than going out. I do not know what the total circumstances would be. The truckers have put some ton mile figures in. If you leave out the movement of western grain I think the rates would be higher from the east to the west, than from the west to the east.

Chart 4 of the brief, which is based on the rate per ton mile shows an average rate from the west to the east of 1.4 cents and from the east to the west of 2.92 cents. That is taking all commodities and that is not only Manitoba, but all western Canada.

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): I would like to ask Mr. Mauro a question. He mentioned being in favour of something similar to the bridge subsidy. I wanted to raise the point that I have had a number of complaints from the fruit growers in British Columbia. They told me they knew that particular subsidy helps goods from central Canada come into Manitoba but it has the opposite effect on those goods of British Columbia. In the case of fruit they would be getting poorer fruit into Manitoba instead of coming from British Columbia.

Mr. MAURO: I said that one alternative was akin to the bridge subsidy, the Bridge Subsidy, is regional subsidy and that is why your fruit people are complaining. I used the context that applying a general rate increase along the same basis of so many cents per hundred plus a percentage increase. There is nothing similar.

Mr. BELL (*Saint John-Albert*): May I ask Mr. Mauro or Mr. Stechishin this question? Yesterday Mr. Roberts of the Canadian Pacific Railway said that the railways transferred some classification after the 17 per cent increase came into effect and that had the result of reducing the increase. I wonder if you have an example in Manitoba of shippers finding that their competition in central Canada or elsewhere had this favourable consideration given to them in rates, and that some people still had to abide by the 17 per cent increase itself?

Mr. STECHISHIN: I cannot think of any specific case. The average shipper, of course, does not concern himself too much with what the terminology of the rate is and he does not care whether it is shown in the tariff as a class, a commodity or competitive rate. He says, "This is my rate".

When the rates went up 17 per cent, the railways put them on as a general increase on all rates inclusive, although they issued what they called a master tariff just saying, "Where a rate says so and so you make it now read 17 per cent higher".