

*National Transportation Act, 1986***NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT, 1986**

## MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Friday, December 19, 1986, consideration of the motion of Mr. Crosbie that Bill C-18, an Act respecting national transportation, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** When Bill C-18 was last before the House, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) proposed an amendment which the Chair took under advisement. I have now had an opportunity to study the amendment. I am prepared to accept it and will therefore propose it to the House. Mr. Benjamin moves in amendment thereto:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following therefor:

Bill C-18, an Act respecting national transportation, be not now read a second time but that the Order be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Transport.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Darryl L. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine):** Mr. Speaker, very seldom do we have an opportunity to come to grips with part of our destiny, our future. In the area of transportation, the last major legislation, the last significant amendment was passed in 1967. So many things have happened during those 20 years, Mr. Speaker. Serious changes here in Canada, in Ontario, in Quebec, in British Columbia, changes in attitudes and significant changes in the way we negotiate with our neighbours, close and remote. Our products and methods of production also have changed.

Our whole history, Mr. Speaker, was already based on our ability to move around in the best possible way, in the fastest possible way, to best survive against the worst of elements. Transportation, Mr. Speaker, always has been the mortar of our national policy.

We depend to a great extent on our transportation systems more especially as a major part of our economic strength is based on the export of our products. The quality of our products, our costs and the reliability of our delivery systems can and should make the difference. So let us have the courage to ask certain questions, Mr. Speaker. Does Canada now have, and will it have tomorrow, the passenger and freight transportation systems required by those new realities?

Does Government approach to transportation problems correspond to recent changes, the last economic upheavals at home and in our other traditional markets?

Recently, our major economic partner has taken new steps in the area of transportation.

It is clear that we are under no obligation to copy what is being done by our neighbours to the south. It is also clear that we cannot afford to ignore the implications of decisions made by those neighbours. So much so, that nearly 80 percent of our external trade is dependent on them. Whether we like it or not, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact.

We have no intention of forgetting that fact. If we do not change, if we do not evolve, we might very well see a significant part of our external trade escape us, and it is rather more difficult to regain markets than to lose them.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It being 5 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

• (1700)

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--MOTIONS**

*[English]*

**TRADE**

## UNRESTRAINED INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, interprovincial trade ought to be unrestrained.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me considerable pleasure to rise to begin debate on this motion. It is probably one of the shortest motions on the Order Paper but that is certainly not on account of it lacking in importance. I must confess that I am an unabashed supporter of free trade. I firmly believe both in theory and in practice that it has been demonstrated that the unrestrained flow of goods and capital, and labour for that matter, results in the maximum benefit for the maximum number of people. In general, I think that concept is supported by most Canadians and by the Governments of those Canadians both at the provincial and federal levels. In general, they would agree with it but then go on to state they have certain exceptions.

The Macdonald Commission report, which was largely prepared under the auspices of the previous Government, was, of course, in support of free trade. The Government of Canada is in continuing GATT negotiations on a world scale. We also, of course, have very important bilateral discussions going on with the United States of America. The harmful effects of recent United States protectionist measures show how important it is that we get this bilateral agreement with the United States, our greatest trading partner.

However, I think it is time that we took a look at what is happening within our own borders, right here at home, right here in Canada. The initial concept of Canada, as we know it today, at the time of Confederation was that there would be a customs and commercial union. This was the idea espoused by the Fathers of Confederation. If we look at what was then the British North America Act of 1867, now renamed the Constitution Act, we see in Section 91, which gives the jurisdiction to the federal Government, that the federal Government was to have the exclusive jurisdiction over the regulation of trade and commerce. That was to prevent the various provinces, the former colonies, from making restrictions among themselves. Similarly, the Constitution of that