

Mr. COOPER: I would like to reserve our position on it, but at the same time I would say that our present thinking is that the rationalization authority should have more power than has now been given to it by Bill No. C-120; it should have the power to make studies and investigation on its own, and that sort of thing, with a view to emphasizing the word "rationalization" more than that word has been emphasized in the present draft of Bill No. C-120.

Mr. SOUTHAM: There is another question I would like to ask. Do you people have access, to or do you engage, so-called outside experts as far as studying the economy of various rates and their application as they affect railways and trucking? I am thinking of the MacPherson royal commission when evidence indicated that there could be a wide variance of opinion on whether some of the rates used by the railroads in setting forth their case were at variance with what the witnesses and other people affected by them thought. As a result they did get advice of independent so-called economic experts. Are you people entirely in agreement with the economic criteria or cost accounting formulae that the railroads used in presenting their opinions on this problem?

Mr. DICKSON: Sir, we feel that our ability to assess railway costs and criteria is a bit inadequate. Certainly we have no access to railway figures. I am not suggesting that we necessarily should. But this whole question of railway costs in relation to rates is something which is relatively new, and there is great emphasis on it in this bill. Here again there will undoubtedly be some reservations about the costs existing between those, who represent the shippers' interest and the railways in the days ahead. At the moment the railways' cost figures, as I say, cannot be challenged except in the way you have indicated, by bringing in your own experts. So far we have not had a demand to challenge the railway cost figures in the same way as the western provinces did in their appearances before the MacPherson royal commission.

Mr. SOUTHAM: Thank you.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Cowan.

Mr. COWAN: Madam Chairman, Mr. Granger asked a question about rates on the coastal waters of Newfoundland. One of the gentlemen heard earlier said that the Maritime Transportation Commission would welcome any kind of assistance which the federal government might give to assist with the rates in the maritimes. I come from central Canada and I would welcome the minimum of effort given by provincial governments in the maritimes. I would like to ask the witnesses today if they think the government subsidy on steamship service in Newfoundland and on the coastal service in 1963-64 in the sum of \$4 million odd is sufficient, or do they think it should be a little larger?

Mr. GRANGER: What has that to do with this committee?

Mr. COWAN: I am following up Mr. Granger's comments on the bill.

Mr. GRANGER: I may not have been in order.

Mr. COWAN: He certainly was not ruled out of order. The subsidies paid by the Canadian government for steamship services last year amounted to \$9 million odd, and for that portion which had to do with Newfoundland coastal service, the amount was \$8 million odd. Do they feel that they have enough, or would they be looking for more?

Mr. COOPER: I do not think this is a matter on which I or any of us are competent to express an opinion, Mr. Cowan.

Mr. REGAN: Perhaps if the maritime provinces should opt out of some of the programs which are designed to protect Ontario, they might then be in a better position.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions?