

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A short question from the Hon. Member for St. Catharines (Mr. Reid).

Mr. Reid: In the moment left, may I ask the Hon. Member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine (Mr. Gray) what the distinction is between the policy of this Government in its process of deregulation from that of the United States, so that it can be said to be truly a made-in-Canada piece of legislation?

Mr. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): This is a made-in-Canada Bill in the sense that this is economic regulatory reform. I should make this point, Mr. Speaker. We talk about deregulation, and perhaps at times Hon. Members would like to create fear that everything will become wide open. This is economic regulatory reform, not complete and utter deregulation. It is made in Canada in the sense that our economic situation today in 1987 is much better than what the economic situation was in the United States. The United States fully deregulated its transportation industry. This is not the case in this Bill. We look at our provisions for northern and remote areas. In the Alaskan situation, the Americans threw it wide open. We have not done that. We have kept regulations. We are guaranteeing essential services. We are leaving openings for contract to tenders for airline operations. This is truly made in Canada for Canadians to help Canadians from east to west.

● (1600)

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate today in the debate on Bill C-18. At the outset I should like to thank the Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud) for agreeing to switching positions with me this afternoon.

I came to the House as a new Member in 1984 and I was fortunate enough to be assigned by my Party to the Standing Committee on Transport. It was an interesting experience to take, through a standing committee, a philosophical base, the *Freedom to Move* paper, to see the reaction from part of the country, to see the legislation which has been drafted, and now to hear the debate. It is not often that within two short years a new Member is able to experience that total process, and I feel pleased to have been part of it.

In preparation for today, I looked at my notes and scanned some of the interventions before the Standing Committee on Transport. As well as understanding more and more of what was happening in the House and in the country—

Mr. McInnes: Just remember Robert Burns.

Mr. Angus: Yes, just remember Robert Burns.

It is clear that the changes to the National Transportation Act are consistent with the philosophy of the Conservative Government. They are consistent with the tack it has taken in a number of areas. Unfortunately that direction leads to the selling off or dismantling of the Canadian economy as we

know it today. It is a grand design which will lead to Canadians having less say over what happens and having less benefit from our own work and investment.

Let me briefly list those areas which are part of that grand design, as I see it. There is the whole question of free trade, of having things on the table, under the table, or beside the table. Things are out there for discussion between our neighbours to the south and ourselves. There are items to be negotiated such as the Auto Pact and now marketing boards. We all remember softwood lumber, shakes and shingles, hogs and sugar. There is also the Bill dealing with patent drug legislation, designed to give American multinational companies the freedom to make as much money as they can, with no protection for Canadian consumers. Natural gas is another example; we are under pressure from the United States, and we are deregulating it. Now there are threats by the American Government and its steel industry concerning steel imports to the United States. What will be next? Will it be hydro exports from Quebec, Manitoba, and Ontario? Will it be water? Will that be on the table as well?

One thing which brings that grand design into focus is the impact of the National Transportation Act or the impact of the deregulation prescribed in Bill C-18. In our Canadian nation we work together as much as we can. We trade within and share resources from western Canada with eastern Canada and finished good from eastern Canada with western Canada. We have a road ribbon and a rail ribbon across the country from East to West. It will start breaking down and will be fragmented as we see those ribbons going north and south. We have already seen Canadian specialty grains going from Vancouver to Seattle and then being shipped out. We have seen potash from western Canada entering at the Saskatchewan—U.S. border and being railed to Chicago, bypassing thousands of miles of track and hundreds of miles of water in Canada. We are even seeing iron ore from the Labrador-Quebec area being shipped to the eastern seaboard of the United States and being railed back to Lake Erie for the American steel mills there. That rail ribbon which bound the country together and existed to create a link could be seen as no longer necessary because of north-south links. If Bill C-18 goes ahead, it will be the final icing on the cake. It will not only allow but encourage, because of its structure, that kind of north-south situation.

Quite frankly, CN and CP are as guilty as the Government because they are the ones that bought subsidiaries in the United States. They are railing Canadian products on their own lines through there, doing Canadian workers out of jobs. If we go to this north-south arrangement in trucking—and we are a little fish in a very big ocean in terms of North American transportation—we will find that large American trucking companies will gradually take over our smaller ones. The largest trucking firm in Canada is about one-thirtieth in terms of order of magnitude compared with United States firms. They have the economies of scale and the grid systems. All the hubs are in place. They could very easily come in and out