

We have done everything possible to persuade people to travel by air. We have not thought of transportation as an integrated service where the railways, buses, airlines or the private car could be used in the most efficient and economical way. We have looked at each mode separately, and that is why they are all in trouble.

This amendment would keep as many farmers as possible moving their grain by rail, and that is why I support it.

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that an Hon. Member to my left from an Ontario riding might have stood up so that I could attack him on a few of the points that Party has brought out today. The Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) talks continually about small business, but collectively the NDP is abusing small businessmen through this amendment.

What we are talking about is the use of trucks as opposed to the railroad—that involves the independent, small businessman. Why is the Hon. Member from British Columbia not here saying the things that other Members of his Party have been saying today so that we can attack him?

Some Members of the NDP talk of the jobs created in Ontario by the production of trucks. The automobile industry is in critical shape, Mr. Speaker, but the truck industry is surviving. It seems that the NDP is determined to get rid of those jobs.

There is room for everyone to benefit in this large segment of the export economy in Canada. Over \$7 billion worth of goods will be shipped out of this country next year; 50 per cent of the tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway come from grain transportation, and I understand that 50 per cent of the revenue of the Port of Vancouver comes from grain transportation. It is therefore important to the entire country. This clause would be a deterrent to the truck industry in Ontario, and I am sure that the Hon. Member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn) would endorse what I am saying. He has not spoken on the motion, however, because he knows he would have to speak against it.

This Party believes in free enterprise, Mr. Speaker, and the trucker is an entrepreneur. He is the person we are trying to protect. We are also trying to protect the producer so that he can get his product to market most efficiently.

The railroads are being doubly subsidized through this Bill, in my opinion. They are another bureaucracy. The NDP agrees with the railroads because the Canadian National is a Crown corporation. They would love the CPR to become a Crown corporation—indeed, they want everything to become a Crown corporation. They are trying to nationalize everything, they do not want entrepreneurs or independent businessmen to succeed. That means they have an axe to grind. They believe in national ownership and we do not, because we have seen it fail. Canadair is a prime example of that. We want the entrepreneur to succeed. The NDP talks about the roads. I agree with my colleague, the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson), that these new tractor trailers with their large tires can go over any roads, even in Ontario when the

Western Grain Transportation Act

half-load limit is on, and particularly around Oshawa where the automobile industry is important. They do not damage the roads the way the small trucks do, the half-ton, the one-ton, the three-ton and the five-ton. The single axles are the ones which cause the damage, and they do not cause the damage because they are that size but because the independent owner overloads them. Therefore, the argument that it is going to destroy the roads is not valid.

● (1730)

What the NDP wants us to do is to build hopper cars. How long does a hopper car last in comparison with a truck? We all know the answer because the Government never replaces hopper cars until they fall apart. So there is very little employment created by the replacement of hopper cars.

Mr. Pepin: You are talking about boxcars.

Mr. Fennell: Boxcars then. I do not care what they are, boxcars or hopper cars. They are railroad cars. Trailers do wear out. They do not last as long. They have to be built with lighter material such as aluminum. Their replacement creates jobs, and that is what we are lacking in this country. The NDP is trying to remove the potential for more employment in its own Provinces. This is shocking to me. It is literally trying to get rid of employment in its own Provinces. One railroad engineer can drive the equivalent of 20 trucks. That is 20 times the number of direct jobs. Then there is the number of indirect jobs created in the production of the trucks.

I do not know how many Hon. Members have spoken on this Bill, but the one thing on which the Province of Ontario has been solidly behind our Party is that there must be equal sharing between the farmer and the railways. That has not been acknowledged by the Government. It wants it all to go to the railroads. It wants to protect its own bureaucracy and its own friends, such as Ian Sinclair. It will not allow a fair share to the producer. If the Government did that, the potential for the trucking industry would probably be even greater. The potential of secondary manufacturing of those products would be even greater. The livestock industry would also probably benefit from it. I cannot see one bit of benefit to this Bill by the amendment which is presented by the New Democratic Party. The Bill needs many changes, but this is one which is not required.

The NDP keeps saying we are in bed with the Liberals. It is the NDP which threw us out of power in 1979. It is the NDP which has endorsed the National Energy Program. So when we are told that we are in bed with the Liberals, I would say that things have been switched around and that that Party is trying to protect itself for the next election.

I thank the House for bearing with me in my few remarks on this motion. I hope I have a further chance to speak on other portions of this Bill.

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Motion No. 34,