

*National Transportation Act, 1986***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT, 1986**

## MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Crosbie that Bill C-18, an Act respecting national transportation, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee, and the amendment of Mr. Benjamin (p. 2756).

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** When the House rose at 1 p.m., the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) had been given the floor.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak for a few minutes on the National Transportation Act. Bill C-18 possibly underlines the need the Government has to establish some kind of credibility. It was an opportunity which the Government could have used, but instead of that the Bill just enhances lack of credibility. Almost every part of the Bill has to be taken separately.

The Government keeps talking about its concern for transportation safety but the Bill itself has no requirement for safety. In fact, there will be a greater possibility of accidents because less time will be spent on safety. When you are trying to make money on a very small margin, you are not going to spend the money on safety.

The Government keeps talking about sovereignty. This Bill will deliver our goods from all across Canada to multinational trucking companies and railways. The Government has also been talking about a philosophy based on competition and that that is the key to the direction it intends to go, but this Bill also lacks credibility in that area. Bill C-18 will decrease the amount of competition available to our transportation system.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but in 10 minutes it is probably not possible to list, let alone explain, all of the areas where the credibility of the Government in this subject should be questioned.

For 100 years transportation has been used as an instrument of policy and economic development. Bill C-18 ignores the economic need for some kind of equal transportation costs for all parts of the country. If you have differences in cost for remote areas than for central Canada you are bound to affect the economic development of those remote parts of the country. This Bill discriminates against people, businessmen and producers on the basis of where they happen to live, a 180 degree change in Government policy.

When Sir John A. Macdonald established the transportation policy for Canada he recognized that transportation could be a major factor in how the country developed. Most of us in this Parliament today would not accept as the basis of his decision-making the fact that he thought the western and the eastern parts of the country should supply the raw materials and that

the central part, Quebec and Ontario, should do the manufacturing. That is long past. We have had somewhat of a movement on that. My predecessor from Prince Albert, John Diefenbaker, recognized, when he was Prime Minister that transportation could be a major factor in how a country developed. In his vision of the north he used transportation as the basis for development right across the northern fringe of the Prairies, in northern Ontario and Quebec. He based that decision on the fact that transportation is a key element to economic development.

Bill C-18 does exactly the opposite. It shows a 180 degree turn from the idea that transportation should be used or could be used to give all parts of the country the same possible advantage. Consequently, we have a situation now where instead of the Government and the country looking at the more remote areas and saying that is where we need some kind of development, we have a Government which looks at the central part of Canada. It is saying, "If we put in place this economic change, this deregulation of transportation, we will make sure that forever and ever, Canada will continue to develop in the so-called Golden Triangle". Those places from which you and I come, Mr. Speaker, will be at a disadvantage. We will not be able to develop or manufacture goods because we will pay so much more for transportation that we will not be able to compete.

● (1510)

Back in the 1800s, the Government established the Crow's Nest Pass agreement. That agreement was put in place so that products from western Canada could move to the East at a lower rate. It also allowed the transportation of settlers' goods from eastern Canada to the West and assisted in the development of western Canada. In the 1920s, Parliament established statutory grain rates. This put into legislation the kind of structure which allowed the West to continue to develop by allowing the West to deliver its product.

The Western Grain Transportation Act which was passed just a couple of years ago, although many of us disagreed with the approach because we recognized it as a first step in the direction we are moving today, recognized that people in the remote areas should not be penalized because of where they live. Instead of that, and I suppose even because of that, we have taken one more step in the direction begun by the Western Grain Transportation Act, of allowing the undermining of an economic policy which assisted in the development of the regions.

I am not necessarily talking of places as far away as Yellowknife. I am talking about communities like Prince Albert and those in northern Manitoba, the Prairies and British Columbia. These communities will be affected by the transportation structure which the Government is putting in place through Bill C-18.

This Bill ignores the reality of Canada. It fails to take into account Canada's geography and its climate. It fails to take into account the needs of a population that has spread across