

Mr. FISHER: Have you ever campaigned or is it still part of your policy that the railways have no business being in the trucking industry.

Mr. MAGEE: Yes, we have spent thousands of dollars to try every conceivable form of legal fight which we could arrange;—and this responsibility is borne by myself, Mr. Goodman and many others in our industry and association staffs—to fight this development and prevent it from growing. We have not attracted too much support from the public or anyone else.

Mr. FISHER: Is your policy in this particular regard based upon the free enterprise thesis that you have in this brief, that because the railways have a record of subsidies and government support in various categories it is unfair to get into a business in which you have to be fully competitive and have no form of subsidy?

Mr. MAGEE: Yes, we want to keep the trucking industry as an independent competitor of the railways. That is the policy of Canadian trucking associations with which, as I say, we are having some very considerable lack of success. But that is our policy and we will continue to make those attempts. We will examine every statute in the country that can be examined that has a bearing on this problem, including the Combines Investigation Act. I want to emphasize that we are continuing our efforts to try to keep our industry independent.

Mr. FISHER: In the long haul to western Canada there has been a tremendous increase in piggy-back service. How is that developing? Has it affected the independent operators in relation to railway competition?

Mr. MAGEE: The independent operators are using piggy-back in increasing numbers, wherever it is being made available by the railways. As the members of the committee know, there was no piggy-backing of trucking industry trailers until last year. Then it started. Up until that time the railways had hauled only their own trailers by piggy-back, and then they made the service available to us. I think there were some in our industry who expected that when we became the patrons of the railways, as well as their competitors that there would be a lessening of competitive problems. But the actual way it has worked out has been quite the reverse. The competition is continuing just as keenly as ever between the two industries, and representatives from both the trucking industry and the railways are out soliciting movement of freight for their particular media. Sometimes freight is secured by both and is moved to Toronto or Montreal on the same flat cars by the same industries.

Mr. FISHER: Is it the general contention of your industry that the lack of competition by the railway in certain fields, as you have outlined in your brief as being shielded from competition, is bad for the efficiency of the railways themselves?

Mr. MAGEE: Yes. If I understand that question correctly, it is this: has the competition acted as a spur upon railroad efficiency?

Mr. FISHER: Yes.

Mr. MAGEE: Very definitely. There was no over-night freight service—and I mean true over-night freight service—in Canada until the trucking industry, through competition, forced the railroads to compete.

In the past few years, under the leadership of Mr. Donald Gordon and Mr. Norris R. Crump, the two main railroads have been subjected to a smartening up procedure. We are receiving very stiff competition from the railroads now, and we are glad to have them as competitors.

Mr. FISHER: You say that there is no freight traffic hauled; that is the exclusive preserve of either railways or trucks. Let us take the grain trade moving down in the Crowsnest pass areas. Is it your contention that that traffic, even, is potentially truck traffic?