

*Transportation*

up into committees, I think we will get away from any advantage that may be acquired by bringing these people together. I believe the commission could serve a much more useful purpose if it were not broken up. I agree that in a sense what will eventually evolve as the practice will be the hearing of a problem by a group of commissioners, or a quorum of the transportation commission as was suggested by the hon. member for Springfield, but I do not think it is necessary to lay down definitely that there shall be a committee on railway transport problems and that committee shall hear nothing but railway transport problems.

If we really want the commission to become fluent and knowledgeable in regard to all modes of transportation, I believe it could better serve that purpose if we did not divide it up as this clause suggests. The members of the commission serving on the commodity pipe line transport committee or the motor vehicle transport committee may well have nothing to do for a couple of years because, as I said earlier, there is at the present time no such animal as a commodity pipe line. There is no commodity pipe line established in Canada. There is no real work for a motor vehicle transport committee.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Therefore why lay down that certain members of the commission shall serve on these committees? Why is it necessary to give a breakdown into committees as this clause of the bill purports to do? I would rather see the bill without subclause 1 of clause 17. I do not see what this subclause accomplishes other than the establishment of a quorum, and I think this could be done better in some other clause of the bill. The minister referred to the quorum when we were discussing clause 5, which says that the following provisions of the Railway Act—and a number of sections are listed—will be included in this bill. However, section 12 of the Railway Act says that only two members shall constitute a quorum. I do not think that two or three members is a sufficient number.

In summary, may I ask the minister to comment on the necessity for giving a breakdown of the commission into committees, other than the setting up of a quorum. Surely a quorum could be established in some way which would allow for greater flexibility and versatility so that members could fluctuate from one committee to another. This would ensure some continuity with regard to regulation of the various modes of transportation. Surely the only real advantage of setting up an all encompassing transport commission is to

[Mr. Horner (Acadia).]

ensure continuity in the regulations concerning the various competitors in the transport field. I fail to see what the breaking down into committees may accomplish.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I am sure that each one of us would have devised a bill which would be different and no matter how it had been done it would have been quite possible to suggest a different method to be followed. The legislation does not require that all these committees be set up before they are needed. I would not expect the motor vehicles committee to be set up in the immediate future, and the commodity pipe lines committee would certainly not be set up until it had something to deal with. Also there is nothing in the bill which says that the members, having been assigned to one of these committees cannot be reassigned from time to time to other committees, and in fact I think that this would be a very desirable thing. It is quite obvious that, in the case of the reviews that are provided, commissioners who have not sat on the original hearing will have to sit on the review, otherwise the review would mean nothing. I do think there is plenty of flexibility here. At the same time we have to remember that it is quite important, if we are to deal with these matters expeditiously, to ensure that a certain number of commissioners who are accustomed to dealing with these matters are appointed. I believe that on balance we will get a fairly good mixture.

**Mr. Horner (Acadia):** Basically my question was whether this was necessary. The minister said that there must be some members who are acquainted with the subject matter with which they are dealing. I believe that this will come of itself without having to be spelled out in the bill. What will happen is that the railways committee will deal with railways and will become knowledgeable on this subject. However, if there is a review of railway rates it will be given to some other group which has not previously dealt with the matter and which is inexperienced on this particular subject. For example if I were a shipper or a manufacturer in a given industry, and were to ask for a review of a ruling on a certain discriminatory freight rate, a group which might not be fully acquainted with that subject might have to deal with it and to overrule the decision of another group which possessed full knowledge of that subject. This is the danger that I see in the setting up of committees.

In such case what chance would a shipper, a manufacturer or the consumer of transported