

Transportation

individual is affected he may appear before the commission to put forward his case. In our opinion he should not have to prove that he has a right to appear.

I wholeheartedly support the amendment after carefully studying clause 16 as put forward by the minister. I urge the minister to put up a better argument than he has up to now with regard to the open-door philosophy and a whole mass of frivolous complaints being brought before the commission. I urge the minister to accept the amendment. I know how congenial he has been in this debate. He should accept the amendment because according to his interpretation everything has already been taken care of in clause 16, and therefore we are really adding very little if we include the amendment. In our interpretation of the clause the amendment will give an individual the inherent right, if he feels he is being discriminated against, to prepare a case, hire counsel if necessary, come to Ottawa and attempt to prove that case. I do not intend to say any more with regard to this amendment. Once again I urge the minister to consider it very carefully, put up a better defence against it or accept it.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Amendment (Mr. Cantelon) negatived.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, you won that one, Jack.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost, on division. Shall clause 16 as amended carry?

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Chairman, we are agreeable to clause 16 passing. In this respect I think there is agreement on this side of the house. We should like an idea of what we have to accomplish in regard to this bill. I understand that the Chairman's ruling will be made fairly soon this evening. There has been some indication of this, I believe.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could correct the hon. gentleman. I believe some of us have been advised that there will be no ruling this evening. I hope I am correct in saying this. I understand that there will

not be this evening any ruling in respect of clause 74. In that event, I believe it would be a very good idea if we could deal with clause 1, which is the only clause left, and conclude some of the general speeches in respect of that clause. After we have dealt with clause 1 perhaps we could take up some other business, because there does not seem to be any prospect of making much progress until we have the ruling in respect of clause 74. I do not see any reason why we should not deal with clause 1, if any hon. member has any general statement to make on it.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 16 as amended carry?

Clause 16 as amended agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the committee consider clause 1 as amended?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On clause 1—*National transportation policy*.

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, there are a few observations I desire to make on clause 1. We have spent a great deal of time on this bill both in committee and in the house. In fact, we spent two months on it before the Christmas recess, and every day since resuming this session. It is an extremely complex bill which had a long involved history before it reached the stage at which it is today—almost passed.

● (8:20 p.m.)

A royal commission appointed in 1958 submitted its last report in 1961. The first draft, C-120, was withdrawn in 1964, and this edition, C-231, is unique in having been considered by the transport committee before being given second reading in the house.

The MacPherson report gave us the principle on which the minister has based Bill C-231, namely that the railroads should be free to set competitive rates. As I have said before, I do not agree with this principle, and everything I have heard throughout this debate has not changed that thought.

The first edition of the bill was so roughly handled outside the house in an impromptu committee meeting of the transport committee that the minister withdrew it, and has now had it completely rewritten. Perhaps I should say he has had it rewritten.

The second edition which came out some two years later had some 70 amendments made to it in committee before reaching the