

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss Jewett: I just wanted to make the third and last point which concerns public benefits. It does relate to the cost-benefit analysis that I think we should be undertaking and are not. The article continues:

Public benefits—"the primary public benefit from an upgrading project is highway cost savings resulting from additional trucking avoided if the line is upgraded rather than abandoned." The quantities shipped in the past on the line in question are converted to equivalent truckloads, their destinations determined, and the impact on the highway system computed.

The point I wanted to make is that that kind of analysis has not been done by the CTC and that it should be done before we proceed any further with the Government's Bill. By passing this motion we would facilitate such studies being done.

Some Hon. Members: More.

Some Hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Albert Cooper (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to enter into debate on Motion No. 35. Before I begin my remarks I want to compliment the Hon. Member who preceded me on her excellent speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cooper: I found it extremely informative and it is one that I will be quite happy to circulate in my riding.

This whole business of trucking and the transportation of grain, as I have expressed earlier in speaking to Motion No. 34, is extremely important to the Peace country. As I have said so many times in the House, it is extremely important because we have a really serious problem with a lack of railway facilities. When you lack rail facilities, you do not have any alternative but to use trucks.

Motion No. 34 caused me a great deal of concern. I was surprised the NDP brought in such an amendment because I know its Members have spoken time and time again about representing the producers who are represented by those people in the Peace country. They could not accomplish that with Motion No. 34.

In Motion No. 35 we are into a little different situation. In that motion it is stated grain can be shipped from points which have not been abandoned on existing rail lines. That is why in my riding that does not affect me. I do not have rail lines that have been abandoned. It is difficult to abandon something that has never been put there in the first place. I see some Government Members on the other side. I want to bring that to their attention. I would very much like a rail line in this part of the country. Failing that, we want the opportunity to use trucks. I think it is important at this point in the debate to bring into focus how serious and how important trucking has been to the Canadian people and the various Canadian industries over the last few years.

In the mid-1940s, shortly after the Second World War, things were beginning to happen in the Peace country in the North. In that particular region of the country there was really

Adjournment Debate

only one form of transportation. Of course, it was trucking. We in the North have grown up with a real sense of gratitude for truckers and a real sense of their significance and importance. Had it not been for the truckers, the entire North, right up into the Territories, areas like Yellowknife and Hay River, would simply have not been opened up and developed. The same thing applies when we talk about grain in my area, areas that are still new land, land that has to be brought onstream, brought into production, and land that will create employment and employment opportunities for the people in my region. That will filter throughout Canada. You cannot accomplish that with railways when they do not exist. Your only alternative is to look at trucks.

I can see that the time is running out very quickly. I want to say very clearly that any motion that deals with trucking and transportation of grain is an absolute must. We must allow that to happen because it has to be allowed to exist in order to protect regions such as the one I represent in the Peace country.

● (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

SHIPPING—MONITORING OF UNCTAD AGREEMENT—EFFECT ON CANADA. (B) REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF STUDIES

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss further a concern with respect to the ratification or the putting in place about a week ago of new UNCTAD arrangements respecting liner conferences. I originally expressed my concern, in a question to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), about the apparent absence of monitoring or any ongoing analysis which might give direction to the Canadian maritime industry; indeed, not only them but the users of vessels for import and export.

I was concerned because at the time, as reported in *Hansard* for October 3, the Minister indicated:

I recognize his concern and would certainly undertake again to ensure that a proper monitoring and analysis are done. We would try to prepare such an assessment for him.

That was the first time I had heard that any monitoring would in fact take place, but we do not know the form of that monitoring. We are not clear as to what kind of analysis will be prepared. In any event, the Minister should not do it for me, he should do it for the industry that is so vitally and deeply involved. It is of some major consequence because it involves 40 per cent of our exports, 40 per cent of our imports and a massive amount of trading. I think we are up around \$5 billion in waterborne transport trade annually. That is an enormous