

have that much confidence in its value let them get out there and talk to truckers, shippers, the small communities, and the provincial Governments who are becoming more and more aware of the Bill's concept and its problems.

Let the committee travel. Let us hear from people in the places affected. Let us go to Moose Jaw, Winnipeg, Thunder Bay and Montreal. When we dealt with *Freedom to Move* we only went to three communities, Halifax, Winnipeg and Vancouver. We never went to Quebec. We did not go to a total of seven provinces. That is not the way to consult.

The last time a Bill of this magnitude, dealing with transportation, was brought in was 20 years ago. That was after a Royal Commission spent two years studying the concept. Apparently a year of that was on the road hearing from specific interest groups and people who cared about the issue. As a result of that full public consultation the legislation was drafted and brought to the House. There was of course no need for an ongoing debate. We have argued time and time again that there is no need to re-invent the wheel. However, we are not giving the same priority to this legislation and Bill C-18. We are not giving the people of Canada the same opportunity to understand how this Bill will affect them. We may find they might agree with the Government. They may think it is the best thing since sliced bread. However, we will not know until we try. It is regrettable that we are not going to have the opportunity, from what I understand, to get out there, but I encourage the Government to reconsider that element, give us a chance to move across the land with the Bill so that more than just the national organizations have a chance to participate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my friend a question. Before doing so I would like to make a comment. During 20 years as Minister of Highways in Alberta, which also included the motor vehicle branch and transport and highways, I had a lot of experience with trucking hearings and the concept of convenience and necessity. The thing I did not like about convenience and necessity was that if a trucker got a licence to operate on a particular route and the business increased, he would add another truck. If the business increased again, he would add yet another truck. He soon had a monopoly of the business on that route. If an applicant tried to gain entry on that route, the first operator could show that he was already providing the service. I did not like that aspect of convenience and necessity because it kept the new, young drivers out of the business.

● (1620)

Another point about extra-provincial traffic was that if a trucker who received a licence in Alberta to operate extra-provincially wanted to go into Saskatchewan, he had to have another hearing in Saskatchewan. This was costly and time consuming. If he wanted to move into Manitoba he had to have another hearing there. Each of these hearings are

Motor Vehicle Transport Act, 1986

expensive because one must bring witnesses and take the time to attend them. Hearings were costing up to \$5,000 or \$10,000. In order to operate in Ontario or Quebec they had to have additional hearings.

This became so expensive that our truckers could not operate on that basis. We asked the other provinces whether they would permit our trucks to pass through their provinces if we allowed their trucks to pass through Alberta. They said no. We could not get an agreement. Therefore, we went to the American states along the border and secured an arrangement with them which allowed their trucks to pass through Alberta without picking up loads, because many of them wanted to go to Alaska, and our trucks to pass through their states without buying a licence.

Consequently, we were able to build a tremendous business hauling meat, as an example, to Montreal. We could not have operated such a business economically without that agreement. There were no more accidents or safety problems. The truckers did not operate longer hours. They had more work, but it did not operate in the way which is now being suggested.

In summary, the operations were costly. The trucker had to add that to his costs and the shipper had to pay. The shipper had to add that to his costs and the consumer had to pay. It increased costs all across the board. Is it sensible to have all that duplication which will put increased costs on the shoulders of the consumers of Canada?

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the intervention and the question of the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). I, too, have some history in regulation of the trucking industry. As the Member knows, I was a member of the select committee in Ontario which spent at least six months studying the issue in the mid-1970s. Therefore, I speak from personal knowledge as well.

No one says that every regulation makes sense. We have admitted that. We admitted it in discussions on *Freedom to Move* as well as in discussions in this House. Quite frankly, there are some dumb regulations.

If a trucker is going from point A to point C, passing through province B, I would say that there is no need to have a licence to travel through, at least in terms of permission to haul. That kind of change makes sense and we would support it. However, my caucus and I are concerned about the impact on the stability.

The Member referred to small companies which get bigger and bigger and have a monopoly. As long as there are rules in place to protect the interests of the consumers, it is a good thing. However, we are worried about something which we have seen happen in the United States. That is, as a result of this Bill and others like it at the provincial level we will end up with such monopolies anyway. In a situation where there are two small operations feeding one town, which can only realistically support one operator, the weaker of the two will go out of business. The stronger operator will still have the monopoly, but this time there will be no rules to protect the