

doing our utmost to build a sound trucking industry. But, it was the feeling of our members that if every rate or service that the railways desired to publish to assist the shippers in Canada could be opposed or delayed or in any way hampered by opposition of the trucking industry, when perhaps they could not provide this type of service or were not directly interested but on general principles they wished to oppose it, then we felt it was not in the best interest of the railways or shippers in Canada. For this reason it is felt they should not have the right to oppose any rail rates or services.

Mr. FISHER: Let us take a problematical situation where there could be a considerable difference of opinion on what a captive area is or what is a captive shipper. I gather from talking to the truckers that there have been disagreements in this particular area. In the determination of rates the truckers may have a very, very considerable, almost a life and death, interest in something the railways do, and yet you would block them off from making any representation of a direct kind. I suppose their only way of putting their case would be indirectly to the cabinet or the ministers involved.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Of course, we can argue a great deal about what is captive traffic and our definition of it; but, if the railways, in their wisdom, can capture some traffic away from the trucking industry which the trucking industry may consider to be captive traffic then, obviously, in our opinion, it was really not captive traffic; and if the railways can provide the service at a cost that is satisfactory to the shipper, then this is the way the traffic should move.

Mr. FISHER: Well, I cannot disagree with that; I am against beating my neighbour's wife. But, let us look at it from another point of view. The MacPherson commission—and the recommendations for amendments to this act are based upon its report—has the theme running through it of the beauty of the present traffic situation in Canada, and the reason they make the recommendations is really that there are so many competing modes of traffic being carried on that, in a sense, you want to insulate the railway mode from the competing modes in so far as representation is concerned.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Of course, as you know, the trucking industry in the United States has the right to oppose or appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission any rail rates, and the railways can do the same against any truck rates, but this has not proven too successful. This has resulted in rates being delayed as much as two or three years waiting for hearings appeals, counter-appeals and so on. We feel this would not be in our best interest if this was allowed to happen.

Mr. FISHER: I just want to say that in the main I disagree with this. It seems to me when we are dealing with recommendations, taking about an integrated system of transportation, flexibility and competing modes, then it is time we had a regulatory authority that was able to listen to representations of all the modes. I think the American example is different by the very size and complexity of their transportation market and the tremendous variety of carriers in terms of ownership and backing. It seems to me it would be much simpler here and very easy for this board to set up rules, which would allow a sort of nominal representation. What is the difference between the set-up you have in Quebec, where the C.N.R. trucking outfit has been before the courts a couple of years and the arrangement in the United States? It seems to me that we cannot look at rates in this country in any over-all way without seeing where the trucking interest stands and, for example, where the water shipping fits in.

I know the rail-water rates would come under this; it has been the tradition that they would come under the board. But here again, we have some new concepts developing in water shipping. I am thinking of the new kind of packaging that is being developed and the rail-water-truck co-ordination.