

Regulatory Reform

agendas is now available for use on most types of personal computers found in hundreds of thousands of homes and, I might underline, hundreds of thousands of offices throughout this country.

The electronic publishing of regulatory agendas is just the first step in a new mode of communication between government and the public, which offers enormous potential. I can see the day, for example, when every Member of Parliament will have a personal computer in his or her office, and will be able to tap into an information system that will provide up-to-the minute data on the latest status of legislation, regulations or other matters of special interest.

Clearly, there is enormous capacity for adapting new technology to the purposes of Government. I am proud that the Government's regulatory reform program has taken something of a lead in the world exploring these possibilities with its regulatory agendas program. Those of us who know the difficulties for small businesses in being able to know what is happening in the world with regard to competition, appreciate their need for information. Going into this field will make available through the electronic medium tapping in quickly and the ability to know not only what are the inhibitions, but what are the opportunities that will be provided to them as entrepreneurs.

I have emphasized the omnibus repeal and records retention legislation and the regulatory agendas program because of their immediate relevance to the motion. Unfortunately, time does not permit me to expand at great length on all the other areas of regulatory reform in which the Government has been active. However, Hon. Members are well aware of the major proposals relating to federal regulation in such areas as airlines, fisheries, occupational health and safety, broadcasting and telecommunications. Indeed, it is hard to think of any Department or agency of the federal Government that has not been addressing the issue of regulatory reform for the past few years.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) for the innovation and wisdom of the new Canadian airline policy which he announced last week. Although the media has tended to refer to the new policy as one of deregulation, it is more accurate to describe it as regulatory reform or, even more accurately, as liberalization.

This is not just a matter of semantics. It is important to recognize the difference between deregulation and regulatory reform. It is very important to understand that distinction. They are not synonymous. As I see it, deregulation is one type of regulatory reform. Indeed, it is the most extreme type of reform because it involves the abandonment of a previously regulated area. There has been reason sometimes, if not always, in the mind of the public to have areas regulated. An extreme course will rarely be the most desirable course of action.

In the United States, airline regulatory reform has indeed gone a long way, and the economic aspects of the industry are largely deregulated. However, there remain stringent regula-

tions on air safety in the United States and these, if anything, have been made tougher than before economic deregulation was introduced. Therefore, regulatory reform can imply both a reduction and a strengthening of regulation.

We in the Government view regulatory reform in that way. Sometimes it should mean less regulation, sometimes it should mean more. We just heard discussion about the dangers of genetic damage to people's bodies in the work place. In other words, people sometimes try for more regulation in certain areas. However, it should always be consistent with the most efficient and effective way to achieve national objectives.

The reform proposed by the Minister of Transport in the case of our new air policy provides a distinctly Canadian blend, allowing for gradual and responsible progress to a more competitive and less regulated air industry, without throwing the baby out with the bath water. Treasury Board's office of regulatory reform has worked closely in the development of these regulatory reform proposals. I think they reflect just how serious our commitment to regulatory reform is.

In short, I am very proud of the record of this Government which has achieved and will continue to achieve major reform wherever it is needed to promote the economic and social development of this country.

I have many industries and businessmen in my riding. I understand the profound concern which they have expressed to ensure that regulations not be redundant or useless but meaningful. I support the steps the federal Government has been taking in the past and in the present. I trust it will continue in the future to press hard to make us effective, efficient and competitive in world markets and at the same time respond to the hundreds of letters I receive every month from people expressing their anxieties and concerns about the dangers in the work place or, in terms of the environment, of chemicals, activities and so on that might endanger them. We have to think of regulations in terms of those needs. We will continue our policy of regulation where absolutely necessary and deregulation wherever possible.

Mr. Chuck Cook (North Vancouver-Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the comment of the previous speaker. He demonstrated a profound lack of knowledge of the whole field of regulation in this country, demonstrated that somebody else had written the speech for him and demonstrated that this Government keeps apologizing for not doing anything in the field of regulation and deregulation, except in a cosmetic way.

The Hon. Member mentioned with great pride that the Government had thrown out 132 sets of regulations and Bills and so forth, a very brilliant thing to do, obviously something of which they can be proud. If you looked at them closely, you would find that no longer do we have regulations governing the use and manufacture of buggy whips. That is what the Government did, not anything meaningful in terms of deregulation.

In 1981, at a cost of \$3 million to the Canadian taxpayer, the Economic Council of Canada came out with two major studies dealing with reforming regulations. There were 66