

Furthermore, we are told that the provisions of this legislation will not affect the manufacture and sale of a tire within a given province provided it does not go beyond the boundaries of that province, interprovincially or internationally. In that regard I would like to quote a section of the Senate committee proceedings dated March 28, 1974, in which Senator Forsey deals with this question. In other words, if a tire is manufactured in a province and sold within that province, this piece of legislation will not apply, and it will not be necessary for that manufacturer to meet the safety standards. Senator Forsey had this to say:

Yes. In fact, he can manufacture one made of chewing gum, if he wishes, provided he does not put this mark on it; and the chewing gum one cannot enter into international or interprovincial trade.

Senator Forsey was saying that a manufacturer in any province can manufacture a tire of chewing gum and sell it within that province, and it will not be governed by this bill. So there is obviously a loophole. As recorded at page 2:9 of the Senate Committee Proceedings for April 4, 1974, Senator van Roggen stated:

● (2150)

This bill will give you the power to pass on all tires imported into Canada, of whatever nature, and on all tires going from one province to another; it will give you the power to pass on tires manufactured anywhere in Canada, if they are to carry your seal or trade mark as proposed in the bill. It will not give you power, constitutionally, I would think to deal with tires manufactured in a province and sold within that province. Are the provinces contemplating parallel regulations?

The expert from the Department of Transport, Dr. Campbell, replied:

Your statement is quite correct, sir.

So there is a loophole in that a large number of tires sold or manufactured within a province will not be covered by this piece of legislation.

Now I come to the question of retreads, Madam Speaker. This bill overlooks a very important element of the tire industry, namely, retreads. There is no provision governing the safety standard, performance, and requirements of retreads, which are a significant part of the tire business in the country. If the bill were designed to make all tires more safe for Canadian consumers surely this important segment of the industry would not be overlooked. When I contemplate these two glaring omissions I can only conclude that the legislation is weak, is mere window dressing. It becomes a farce—perhaps it could be accurately described as half window dressing and half serious.

It is interesting to note that in this particular area the industry is more concerned about the safety standards on recaps than is the government. As recorded at page 2:18 of the committee proceedings for April 4, 1974, Dr. Campbell stated:

With regard to recapped tires, it has been impossible to the present time to write a true performance standard. The only thing that can be prepared at the present time, to the best of my knowledge, is a code of good practice in retreading, and we are in the process of working with the provinces, through the Canadian Standard Association, to develop this so that the provinces could use it to exercise some control over local businesses engaged in retreading tires.

Also as recorded at the same page, Mr. Moore, of Firestone stated as follows:

### *Tire Safety Act*

Mr. Chairman, if I could relate back to the retread system, I am not certain that Dr. Campbell should not be concerned with retread standards, because retreading is not just a small provincial matter. I am not sure whether you are aware of it or not, but the two biggest retreaders in Canada are right here in this room, that is Firestone and Goodyear. Retreaded products are sometimes transported from province to province, so in that respect there is not much difference between them and new tires.

I know that some of the provinces are considering retread legislation or retread standards. I know that we have had conversations with some of the provinces. I would not be adverse to seeing the retreads handled in the same way as new tires, that is, by the federal government.

This legislation does not cover that, Madam Speaker, and this is another of its deficiencies.

I now come to the section where the government and its bureaucratic masterminds really want to flex their muscles, and that is with respect to the retailers and distributors. Generally this represents the small business element in the community. It is typical of the government that it has done everything to stymie this sort of enterprise. This bill is another example of imposing more government regulations which cause frustration to the small businessman.

Two responsibilities are thrust upon small businessmen. The first is to establish and maintain a record of every tire sold and of subsequent resales. This is to be done in order that a recall system—which is the second responsibility—may be established for the purpose of advising owners of potential defects or failures in a tire sold by a manufacturer, distributor, importer, or retailer. All I can say about that is that in my view it is a theoretical dream based upon ignorance and impracticality. Surely we cannot be serious about this proposal.

What is the government attempting? It is really attempting to treat a tire like an automobile. Just because we have had recalls on automobiles that does not mean tires should be handled in the same fashion. Larger numbers and more people are involved in the trading network. It is impossible to impose and administer an effective policing of tires. This had to be absurd, Madam Speaker—it is beyond the realm of reality or imagination. About 20 million tires are sold in this country each year. If you accept the formula that a tire goes through the hands of three different people before it reaches the consumer, that would mean something in the order of 60 million transactions. Talk about that bureaucratization! I have never seen the like of it.

A record system of this magnitude is estimated to cost from 30 cents to 50 cents per tire. If you take 20 million tires at 50 cents that comes to \$10 million. And who pays? The consumer pays. Then there is the army of inspectors at \$25,000 to \$30,000 per year to harass—and who pays? The taxpayer pays. Then will it be effective?

My hon. colleague just pointed out that experience in the United States indicates that such a system is 20 per cent or 30 per cent effective. Nobody can tell me that by passing this bill we can ensure that on a given day a particular owner or a potential buyer can be identified. If members of the government are trying to perpetuate this kind of myth, I hope they will re-examine the legislation. I hope they will re-examine some of the evidence and the history of similar legislation in other parts of the world.