tion of those words to the witnesses as an example of "the many-sidedness of truth."

I have no intention of going at great length or in detail into the evidence produced before the committee, but I do wish to examine for a few moments some of what, to my mind, are the fundamental factors in the railway problem of this country.

The first observation I would make is this. In view of the geographical position of the country, it would be surprising indeed if Canada did not have a railway problem. Our centres of population are spread out for a distance of more than 3,500 miles along the border of the United States, but very seldom at a distance exceeding one or two hundred miles north of that border. In other words, we have length without breadth. That condition, of course, means that our railways have had to be constructed over very long and in places very sparsely populated areas of country.

Furthermore, the country is divided into four clearly marked areas—the Maritime Provinces, the central provinces of Quebec and Ontario, the Prairie Provinces, and the Pacific province of British Columbia. Between each area and the next there is a formidable natural barrier. The mountains of Gaspé separate the Maritime Provinces from Quebec; the vast area of lake and rock and scrub pine north of Lake Superior divides Ontario from the Prairie Provinces; the Rocky Mountains form an eternal and almost impenetrable barrier between the Prairie Provinces and the Pacific coast province of British Columbia. All this means that our railways have to be built over long distances and across areas in which engineering difficulties are great and which in themselves are incapable of producing the traffic necessary to sustain those lines.

There are also economic considerations. Naturally the volume of trade in the different areas of our own country would flow south to corresponding areas in the United States. Normally, the direction of traffic on the North American continent would be north and south. But for national reasons we have turned it around and made it travel in an unnatural direction, east and west. We have had to do this for the purpose of binding the various parts of the country together into one. The development of Canada can be said to be largely the history of a struggle against geography, and I think it is not too much to say that the railways have been, are, and will continue to be, the life-line keeping the country together.

That brings me to the remark that the railway problem cannot be segregated; cannot be put into a corner by itself and considered by itself. It is a part of the whole problem of the national development of this country.

Now, I have referred to the natural barriers which make our railway position difficult. There are certain further economic factors which should be taken into consideration. Firstly, we are a great exporting country. We export to the markets of the world very large quantities of products, some of them from the centre of the country. Consequently our railways are called upon to transport them to the seaboard of the Atlantic or the Pacific at rates which are low enough to permit them to compete with the products of other countries in the markets of the world.

A second factor is this. We are still largely an undeveloped country. In certain sections of the Dominion, for colonization purposes, we have built lines to open up new stretches of land. We have also built lines for development purposes, in order to reach some of the natural resources and products. In the normal course of events these lines, in themselves, could not be expected to pay.

All these observations lead me back to the remark with which I began, that Canada, of all countries, is the one in which you would naturally expect a railway problem to exist.

Then of course we are confronted with the new problems which face railroads in every country of the world, problems resulting from the development of new sources of competition from the highways, airways, waterways, pipe lines, and so forth. As so often occurs in the consideration of our own national affairs, we can profit by the experience of the country to the south of us. The other day I happened to run across an article dealing with the general subject of railways in the United States, and it appeared to me to contain a number of points equally relevant to our own situation. The article, entitled "Transportation Developments in the United States," was written by a Mr. Fred Lavis, a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and was published in the Proceedings of that society for November, 1938. Mr. Lavis makes a number of points which I think would be of interest to the House, but I do not intend to weary honourable members by quoting at length. The first of these points relates to a matter that has been discussed by several honourable members in this debate, namely, the extent to which motor carriers have superseded the railways in the carriage of freight. In a table showing the total ton-miles of freight carried in the United States during 1936, the last year for which figures were available at the time he wrote his article, he shows what proportions of the total were distributed among the various transportation agencies: steam railways, waterways, motor carriers, petroleum pipe lines and