

Mr. MAGEE: Really, what we are asking for here, Mr. Chevrier—and we are realistic and know that it is not going to happen—is that we are asking that the bill not be passed; we are not asking that the subsidy be extended to us.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You have about as much chance of doing that as we have of moving over to the other side of the house.

Mr. FISHER: Further to the point which Mr. Chevrier made, in your brief you have indicated certain trends. As an example, about 25 or 30 years ago there was a trend that the insurance companies in Canada wanted insurance regulations under provincial jurisdiction. Now the majority of them want nation-wide jurisdiction. Is it not possible as your interprovincial trucking lines extend and it becomes more and more the pattern of your business, that the impetus will be in the very direction Mr. Chevrier mentioned, that is putting you into a position where the federal jurisdiction is by far the most important?

Mr. MAGEE: There is no doubt that a number of interprovincial and international truck operators in Canada are swinging towards a belief that control by a federal body would be the best form of control for trucking. The trucking industry officially as represented by the Canadian Trucking Associations Incorporated in their majority opinion still supports the principle of control imposed in the Motor Vehicle Transport Act of 1954, although shortly we are going to suggest some improvements which we think could be made in that type of control.

Mr. FISHER: But you do not deny the trend?

Mr. MAGEE: There is a trend among some of the operators for support of control by a board in Ottawa.

Mr. FISHER: If I may I would like to ask a question of Mr. Scott. Mr. Scott, are you the person who wrote this article on the cost structure of the transportation industry?

Mr. GEORGE A. SCOTT (*Director of Economics Policy Branch, Department of Transport*): No, I am not.

Mr. BELL (*Saint John-Albert*): May I ask a question which follows along the lines of Mr. Chevrier's thoughts. You said in respect of the maritime region, as revealed by the figures, that the subsidy has greatly affected the maritime competitive position, and then you made the further point, which I appreciate, about how you cannot have it both ways and how truck competition might be desirable. I am just wondering if we might take that a little bit further in the light of what you said this morning whereby you recognize to some degree the inevitability of maritime freight rate subsidies and also said you made an approach to it in the interdepartmental committee.

I realize that the maritime situation is a little bit different in this respect to the total national point of view, but I ask you do you feel you should just continue to make approaches to come under these further subsidies which you recognize, or do you have any other solution to the particular problem in the maritime region, because there is an inconsistency there.

Mr. MAGEE: Suppose we recommend that the Maritime Freight Rates Act be repealed. I think we would be very unpopular east of Levis if we did that.

Mr. BELL (*Saint John-Albert*): I realize you are just expressing yourself. What could be substituted if there were not a subsidy? Can you carry your thought further?

Mr. MAGEE: I may have misunderstood the question. I think you are referring to some alternative measure if there were an inequality in the competitive positions between the railways and the trucking industry caused by