

the collective agreement. There is, for example, attached to the Automotive Transport Association of Ontario, a motor transport industrial relations bureau with a full-time staff. Mr. Goodman could tell you how it operates.

They are the people who deal with the teamsters union on behalf of the substantial for-hire truck operators in Ontario.

Mr. CHOWN: Are you making recommendations to cabinet on behalf of your industry in respect of a specific term, or terms of reference for the royal commission?

Mr. MAGEE: No, sir. It is not our intention to make any recommendations to the cabinet on the terms of reference of the royal commission; but whatever are the terms of reference, we are prepared to do our full part in any way we can to assist in the inquiries.

Mr. CHOWN: Would this not be a good idea in order to assist the cabinet?

Mr. MAGEE: I think our feeling is that it might seem a little presumptuous, coming from a private organization, to suggest the terms of reference for a royal commission inquiry.

Mr. CHOWN: My only reason for saying that is the cabinet is seized with the problems in detail as regards the railways, but because you have never been associated with any government agency, such as the board of transport commissioners, there is likely to be less detailed knowledge about your industry than there is about the railways. For that reason, I thought perhaps it would not be presumptuous if you did make a suggestion along those lines.

Mr. MAGEE: Yes; I see the point. Really, the way it works out is that even if the terms of reference do not specifically mention trucking, we inevitably get thrown into these inquiries as a result of something said. Our experience with the Turgeon royal commission is an example.

At the end of 1948 after the commission was announced, but before the personnel of it were announced, we decided that the Canadian Trucking Associations would participate in the inquiry and cooperate in any way it could. When we discovered that there was no specific reference to trucking in the terms of reference, and we were so informed of that by the government at the time, we assumed it would not involve us.

However, at the regional hearings of the royal commission which were held across Canada in the summer of 1949, practically fifty per cent of the discussion which took place every day concerned the trucking industry. So we entered the hearings when the final hearings began in November and we were represented by counsel from then on right through until the end of the formal hearings in May, 1951, when the hearings ended. Based on that experience it is our intention to be represented on the first day of this inquiry.

Mr. McPHILLIPS: This subsidy which is contemplated in this bill, of course, arises because of the 17 per cent increase which was given to cover wages. Now in the railway operations increased wages were paid to those in the running trade operation of passenger trains which loses money. In your industry you do not have that disadvantage of sustaining a loss; you do not carry passengers.

Mr. MAGEE: That is correct. If there are other passenger operations being conducted at a loss, that is a situation which, I would think, undoubtedly would be examined by the royal commission and some recommendations made concerning it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Does not much of the discussion arising in connection with your presentation and the principle which you enunciate depend upon the fact that the railways are controlled by a body such as the board of transport commissioners and you do not have a similar controlling body? Does not much of the difficulty, as between the competitive position of the railways on the one