

National Transportation Act, 1986

[English]

The other thing that worries me is this whole business of the intermodal system. It means rail traffic is put on the highway. The same plan I have here from CN Rail talks about the fact that west of the City of Ottawa CN will shut down what is known as the Beachburg subdivision in the riding of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke (Mr. Hopkins). That means that all the trucks going north to service the pulp and paper industry will be going down the highway. The highway is also subsidized, like the rail line. It is paid for by our tax dollars. Highways will be ruined. Provincial taxes are paying to maintain those roads. And what about the increase in accidents and everything else resulting from shifting rail traffic to the highways?

The Government had better think again about what it is doing. What I see it doing to the constituency that I represent is not right, it is not fair, and I know I am not the only one who does not like it. I see the Member for Ottawa—Carleton across the way, and probably the Hon. Member for Stormont—Dundas (Mr. Warner) has views of his own on the issue. We want the Ottawa to Montreal rail line maintained so that we can have it to service the industries and the passengers of the area that I represent.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in closing that I believe that the Government should review its deregulation policies. It should ensure that the railroads maintain their tracks so that we can continue to have in Canada fair service for both the industrial and the farming communities, especially in the underprivileged areas, some of which can be found as close as 100 kilometers from the National Capital in my own constituency.

[English]

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention earlier today to rise to speak on Bill C-18. What bothers me is that the Bill and the policies behind it have been studied to death. They have been before the Standing Committee on Transport on two occasions. The committee has travelled across the entire country.

Mr. Boudria: No.

Mr. Blenkarn: It did a trip through the North. It has made recommendations and gone over the whole philosophy behind Freedom to Move.

Mr. Boudria: The committee went to three Canadian provinces.

Mr. Blenkarn: The policy was discussed in the last Parliament. It has been discussed since this Parliament commenced, and now we wind up with more debate and a resolution suggesting that it go back to the committee again. This is absolutely ridiculous. It is an indication that the opposition mentality of the two Parties that form a corner of the House is one opposed to change. They are stuck in the mud. They say:

“Please don’t deregulate anything. Please don’t change anything. My goodness gracious, let us leave Canada where it was in 1950 or 1940. If we had a railway then, let us keep the same railway. Let us not change anything”. I am surprised they allowed longer railway cars and bigger transport trucks. With their mentality, I am surprised that they would even fly on a jet airplane.

● (1630)

The Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) said that there can be foreign intervention in a company worth under \$5 million. My goodness gracious, that would not even be a down payment on a decent sized airplane. What kind of nonsense is that?

Mr. Boudria: What about the trucking business?

Mr. Blenkarn: Yes, a few trucks can be purchased for that amount, I suppose. Here he is all worried about the trucking business, yet he is saying that this business of PCV licences and preventing a man from buying a truck and carrying freight from one place to another on his own without some provision from some big bureaucrat and some board of transport must stay in place. Opposition Members say: “Let’s keep monopolies and make sure that the little guy has not got a chance but only the guys who can afford to buy PCV licences”.

Before I came to this place, I can recall appearing before the Highway Transport Board fighting for little guys who had all sorts of letters from people who wanted to use their services. These little guys were trying to prove public necessity and convenience. All the big boys were there with 10, 12 or 14 lawyers at a time. If they did not bankrupt the little guys with legal fees, they destroyed them with one argument after another, proving that it would be against the public interest and convenience to grant these applications. This must stop. The situation has been the same with respect to highway transport, air transport and every form of movement in Canada.

Members of the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party want to preserve the *status quo*. They do not believe in change, development or anything new. They believe that letting the new guy on the block get into business is wrong. That is the kind of philosophy that Canadians have surely refused.

We are told that intermodal transportation is bad. We are told that using the highways is somehow wrong and that the highways are subsidized by the public. Yes, they are subsidized. They are subsidized by the public paying enormous taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel.

In the Province of Ontario, it was at one time the fuel taxes that built the roads. It is now the fuel taxes that pay for everything else as well. Not only are fuel taxes more than sufficient to cover all of the road maintenance required but they even supply money for hospitals and goodness knows what