$35\frac{1}{2}$ cents per 100 pounds. In other words, the Summerside shipper is now $40\frac{1}{2}$ cents worse off than in 1930 in relation to his competitor at Port Dover.

Appendix 3 shows that for the movement of steel bars, Amherst, Nova Scotia had an advantage of up to 30 cents a ton in relation to Montreal in the Quebec market in the early 1930's. With the development of truck competition coupled with the post war rate increases between Montreal and Quebec, this advantage has become a disadvantage of \$3.20 per ton. In other words, the Amherst shipper is now \$3.50 per ton worse off in relation to his competitor than he was in 1934.

Appendix 4 shows that the Sackville, New Brunswick manufacturer of stoves and ranges had an advantage of 20 cents per 100 pounds in the Montreal market in relation to his competitor at Hamilton, Ontario when the Maritime Freight Rates Act was passed in 1927. With the phenomenal growth in competition between Hamilton and Montreal, coupled with the application of the post war increase largely in full, to the Sackville traffic, the rate relationship between the two manufacturers has been distorted until the Sackville company is now at a disadvantage of 21 cents per 100 pounds. In other words the Sackville stove manufacturer's rate position in the Montreal market has been worsened by 41 cents per 100 pounds since 1927.

Appendix 5 shows that a Nova Scotia canner of apple products had a rate relationship with his competitor at Thornbury, Ontario in the Ottawa market which left him with a disadvantage of 16 cents per 100 pounds in 1937. Following various changes both upward and downward, the disadvantage of the Nova Scotia producer is 35½ cents per 100 pounds or more than double what it was in 1937. It should be noted that the rate of 78 cents from the Annapolis Valley today is an agreed charge presumably to meet competition. Because of the distance involved, I submit that increased competition is not going to reduce the Annapolis Valley rate to its original relationship with Thornbury. In fact, I doubt that increased competition will reduce it any at all—it may only keep it from advancing rapidly. It should also be noted in respect of Appendix 5 that the rate from Thornbury is lower today than it was in 1937. It has escaped all post war increases!

Appendix 6 shows the relationship of rates on basic iron and steel products from Sydney, Nova Scotia to Montreal, Quebec versus from Hamilton, Ontario to Montreal, Quebec. It shows that the gap between the Sydney company and the Hamilton company has grown over the years, particularly during the period when navigation on the St. Lawrence seaway is possible.

And finally, appendix 7 shows the effects that horizontal freight rate increases have had on rate relationships. The rates shown in this appendix are those applicable on wall plaster from Hillsboro, New Brunswick and from Montreal, Quebec to Toronto, Ontario. In this appendix both rates have been increased by all authorized horizontal freight rate increases. Because the Montreal rate was lower originally (actually 14 cents per 100 pounds) it has not advanced as many cents per 100 pounds as the New Brunswick company's rate has. In this case the New Brunswick company's disadvantage of 14 cents has grown to 21 cents and were it not for the increased rate of assistance provided by the Maritime Freight Rates Act in 1957 the spread would have increased to 24 cents instead of 21 cents. Thus, while both these rates have taken the same percentage increase, it is the relationship of rates in cents per 100 pounds or cents per unit of traffic that is the meaningful figure for shippers or receivers.

The Acting Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Cooper and Mr. Dickson.

Mr. Stewart has indicated that he wishes to put a question.

Mr. Stewart: Madam Chairman, I would like to begin by congratulating the Maritimes Transportation Commission for a very well organized presenta-