

*National Transportation Act, 1986*

So now I can understand what frame of mind that Member was in when he voted. But he did not answer my question, namely, how he would explain to his people why he voted against the motion that dealt with regional development.

**Mr. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine):** Mr. Speaker, I think that at the same time the Hon. Member wants to play with figures. But as I said, during 16 years 28 per cent unemployment rate was acceptable in my area, at home. Never will I say that 18 per cent is acceptable. It will never be as long as I am a Member in this House.

But under the Liberal Government, such was the situation—28 per cent was okay. Because we, in the Gaspé Peninsula, in the Madeleine Islands, we did not count. That is not the situation, Mr. Speaker.

As far as regional development is concerned, since he is mentioning that in respect of transportation, we voted for the clause under which transportation is a key to regional development.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague says that I am against regional development, but past experience shows that his own colleagues have always been against any development.

But, Mr. Speaker, we in the Progressive Conservative Party are in favour of our regional development.

[English]

**Mr. Belsher:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Hon. Member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine (Mr. Gray) on his excellent address to us concerning Bill C-18 and also the balanced explanation that he has given of the Bill that is before us. What I would like to ask the Hon. Member is this. He will recall that when representatives of CN and CP appeared before the committee, they drew attention to the fact that they felt that their revenue was at risk. Yet, under questioning, we heard their freight would not be at risk, that there would not be any lessening in the amount of goods that would have to be carried because of the two Bills under discussion.

● (2130)

Would the Hon. Member care to comment in terms of whether or not we have been able to strike a reasonable balance between the interests of the shippers and the carriers in the Bill that is before us.

**Mr. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine):** Insofar as the railroads are concerned, the evidence is clear that there will be no lack of volume of traffic. There is always the matter of competition.

This Bill strikes a balance between the interests of the users and the carriers. In the past, our transportation system has always benefited the carrier. Under Bill C-18 and Bill C-19, not only will the carrier benefit, but so too will the shipper and the consumer. This country is made up of not only carriers,

Mr. Speaker, but users and consumers, and this Government is ensuring fairness for all sectors.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) on a question or comment.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, no Member of Parliament from Winnipeg, regardless of the Party to which he or she belongs, could do other than take a vital interest in the question of transportation and the need of the Canadian people for an efficient and safe transportation system.

Transportation is the reason that Winnipeg became an important city. It is a city that has had an historic role in terms of the evolution of road, rail and air traffic in this country. Even before Winnipeg became a city, the lakes and rivers of Manitoba served as important highways for goods moving from eastern Canada to the West.

Winnipeg is home to a large number of CNR, CPR and VIA employees. As well, it is home to a large number of airline employees—and this despite the fact that Air Canada, in the Liberal Government years, saw fit to move its headquarters and most of its main operations from Winnipeg, where it started, to Montreal. As well, Winnipeg is the historic centre of the Canadian grain industry.

We would support any legislation, Mr. Speaker, which enhanced the role of transportation in the West, and in Winnipeg in particular. But in looking at Bill C-18, we see that it fails spectacularly in terms of meeting the coming needs of the Canadian people for the efficient and safe movement of goods and people. Bill C-18 does nothing, Mr. Speaker, to make good on the many promises which have been made concerning rail safety.

I remind Hon. Members that in recent years we have had the disastrous crash at Hinton, Alberta; a major failure of equipment in Mississauga which could have led to a tremendous loss of life; and in the City of Winnipeg, a major spill along the main line of the CPR. This Bill does nothing to stop the pending lay-off of air traffic controllers, 17 of whom work in the Winnipeg area. This Bill does nothing to meet the problems caused by deregulation in the air transport area, problems that are documented almost daily in the United States.

What we see in the U.S. as a result of airline deregulation is lateness, overcrowding, poor service, dangerous flying conditions, and galloping mergers which limit rather than promote competition. Coincidentally, Mr. Speaker, in today's *Globe and Mail*, the *Globe and Mail* of June 17, 1987, we have an article headed: "U.S. airlines reeling from deregulation." This is the kind of thing that this Government invites in passing Bill C-18.

Let me just read a couple of sentences from that article. I quote:

Lineups, sloppy service, flight delays, missed connections and unexplained cancellations have plagued U.S. air passengers since economic deregulation of the airlines went into effect in 1978.