

Motor Vehicle Transport Act, 1986

consumer from exorbitant rate increases, reductions in service, etcetera. That is why we are taking the position which we are on this legislation.

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Speaker, during his intervention the Member quoted a letter from concerned shippers. Could he give us an indication of who are those concerned shippers? Is that the group responsible for the few letters of support for this Bill?

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I can advise my colleague and other Members of the House that the Coalition of Concerned Shippers lists as its members the Atlantic Provinces Transportation Commission, the Canadian Chemical Producers' Association, the Canadian Export Association, the Canadian Fertilizer Institute, the Canadian Industrial Transportation League, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Canadian National Millers Association, the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, the Coal Association of Canada, the Council of Forest Industries, the Grocery Products Manufacturers of Canada, the Mining Association of Canada, the Propane Gas Association of Canada and the Retail Council of Canada.

In my mind those groups represent the larger sectors of our economic society. They are not the mom and pop corner stores which we are all concerned about protecting. They are the big folks and they are the ones who support this Bill. They have the volume business. They already have a chance of getting breaks because of the vast amount of goods which they ship, unlike the smaller concerns which operate less than truckload all the time. We know who this organization represents. We are receiving letters from both small and large truckers and from individual Canadians who are concerned about this legislation.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pursue one further matter with the Hon. Member. He mentioned that monopolies are possible. It is not only possible, it happens. I can cite the example of the bus service between Calgary and Edmonton. Greyhound operates a bus every hour for 10 hours each day, both ways. No other bus line can possibly get in. Greyhound simply adds more buses and has acquired a complete monopoly. There is no longer even a railway to compete. I have nothing against Greyhound, but I know of two or three other firms which would like to operate as well. They could give equally good service, but they cannot get in because, for one thing, they cannot afford the hearings.

The Member says that it is okay as long as we protect the shippers. I believe that truckers are very responsible people. When they are starting up a business to operate, intra or inter, they must spend a lot of money. A truck is not bought with peanuts today. They must make a big investment. They will not go where there is no business. They will go where there is ample business for two. They will carry out their own feasibility studies before entering that market to determine whether their business will survive. Obviously, no one wants to go bankrupt, but there seems to be a suggestion that truckers will

be irresponsible. I believe they are very responsible and will conduct their business accordingly.

● (1630)

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, let me give the Hon. Member an example. The National Energy Board just approved the construction of a parallel pipeline to a plant in southern Ontario. If the Hon. Member compares that to allowing two buses to run in a community that is already served well, I think he will understand the point I am trying to make. We need efficiency of service and quality of service; we do not necessarily need competition to obtain that. We simply need the service and the controls to make sure that people are protected.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The floor will be given on debate to the Hon. Member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke (Mr. Hopkins). It will be the last speech with a 20-minute maximum.

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-19, unlike many Bills that pass through this House, is much more complex than can be seen on the surface.

I believe that monopolies can also exist under deregulation. The well-heeled businesses will survive. It will be very difficult for the smaller firms to combat the larger trucking firms from the United States in a deregulated system under Bill C-19.

Bill C-19 should not be passed into law until Canadian tax reforms have been established. Tax reform and deregulation in the United States took place at the same time and it is believed that the U.S. tax reforms have given the U.S. for-hire trucking industry a competitive advantage over the Canadian industry. The U.S. trucking industry has cost advantages due to less government intervention in labour-management relations, higher tax write-offs related to depreciation, lower taxes on fuel, and lower taxes on the trucking industry as a whole. This already puts the Canadian trucking industry on the defensive.

The Government should not implement this policy unilaterally without giving the Canadian trucking industry some support through lower taxes and lower fuel costs.

Bill C-19 should not be passed until a national safety code is completed, as has been pointed out by almost every Member who has spoken in this debate. Those who say that deregulation is the ultimate achievement of private enterprise are not being straightforward. If we are to operate under a regime which allows anyone to operate a trucking business, we need a safety code and it will be necessary to have an army of officers to enforce the safety rules once they are put in place.

A national safety code would prevent the situation which presently exists in the United States. Since 1980, when the U.S. Motor Carrier Act was passed deregulating the trucking industry, seven out of ten trucks have been taken off the road because of unsafe equipment. Accidents involving trucks have increased by 18 per cent in the United States since 1980. I suggest that it is not simply a trend, or that drivers are more careless, but that it is rather a reflection of the condition of the