

### *Regulatory Reform*

survive because 30 per cent of our Gross National Product is generated through exports.

Why do we need a federal-provincial-territorial conference? It is primarily because the regulatory burden is imposed not simply and only by the federal Government, it is imposed by provincial and municipal governments. There is considerable overlapping and duplication. There is extensive complexity in the regulations that are being imposed. In many cases they are an impediment and a detriment to the activity of a free-flowing enterprise system. Due to our split jurisdictional nature in this country, it is important that we wrestle with this problem on a federal-provincial basis.

During the last ten years in particular there has been a confrontational kind of approach taken by the federal Government, which has meant that there has not been a good relationship between the federal Government and the provinces. Consequently, the co-operative environment has clearly been tarnished very badly. As a result, not only do individual Canadians lose but business enterprises lose as well.

We have been tending to build up barriers and regulations which impede trade and commerce. I recall a study that was conducted by the Ontario Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce wherein it was stated, in an analysis of the burden of regulations and the obstacles and impediments to the free flow of interprovincial trade, that we have more barriers and obstacles in Canada than exist in the European Economic Community. That simply must stop. We must preserve the Canadian economic unit. We have to return to the realization that we are a federalist system and we must restore the political and economic partnership that is so important in this country. By reviving the spirit of co-operation and working together, a conference of this nature would clearly pave the way for the necessary deregulation in many areas. Currently, the trucking industry is faced with intense pressure from the deregulated environment of the United States. Trucking is an industry that is virtually controlled by provincial governments. There must be a means of developing a greater degree of uniformity and compatibility of the rules and regulations as they relate to the trucking industry from province to province.

There is also much confusion in the jurisdiction relating to labour codes and occupational health and safety. Many businesses do not comply simply because of the myriad of regulations being promulgated. We are preoccupied and hear much in the House today about the need for job creation. Sometimes we are counterproductive because, while we implore industry and everyone else to take action to create jobs, we frustrate that ability to create jobs as a result of the excessive regulatory burden. That is a clear example of how we are sometimes counterproductive in the House.

The federal-provincial conference of which I speak is only one of a series of initiatives that I believe should be undertaken. I suggest that it is a laudable objective and a very practical, commonsense approach. We can also consider other approaches, such as the suggestion made by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association that a two-year moratorium be imposed on new regulations that do not contribute directly to

economic growth. That proposal was made in 1982. As well, it seems to me that all regulations and regulatory agencies should be subject to a sunset provision and periodic review, so that when they are put in place they do not remain for years and years without compulsory review.

Once again, leadership can be shown through a commitment from all levels of government to reduce the regulatory burden. I believe that deregulation in this country is inevitable. I think most Canadians agree that in order for this country to grow and prosper we must become more competitive, aggressive and market-oriented. I believe that Canadians will no longer put up with interventionist type of policies that we have had during the last ten years, coupled with huge deficits and an over-regulated environment.

We believe, as I am sure many Members of the House do, that the experience in the United States with respect to deregulation of transportation, communications and finance and the various free trade initiatives that are under way, as reflected by the GATT tariff negotiations and the trend toward a more flexible and loose economic environment, are all signals that we should get on with the job. I believe that in this country our industries are strong enough to compete with the best of them in the international marketplace if they are freed up and allowed to function in a free-wheeling manner. I think our business people and our industries would welcome the kind of flexible, competitive environment of which I speak. I do not believe the Government should delay any longer. I do not think we have to import deregulation from the United States. We are a unique and sovereign country. We can develop our approach to deregulation in a unique Canadian way and in a thoughtful and orderly manner in consultation with other administrations and industry. It is a challenge that we all have. This is one step further in achieving and meeting that challenge. I commend it to the House for favourable consideration.

● (1620)

**Mr. Roland de Corneille (Eglinton-Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to discuss the subject of regulatory reform. It is a subject of great importance and has been treated as such by this Government. In saying that, I am obviously taking issue with my hon. friend from Vegreville.

At a time of economic difficulty, regulatory reform takes on an even greater significance than at other times. Because of this, the Government has followed a policy for several years now of promoting regulatory reform that will assure maximum efficiency and a minimum possible intrusion of regulations in the private sector.

The motion before us suggests that the federal Government should convene a federal-provincial-territorial conference on regulatory reform. That is in effect the substance of the motion. It recognizes the fact, therefore, that no single level of government can resolve the multitude of regulatory reform issued by itself. In fact, my hon. friend has already referred to that point, that it requires involvement not only of the federal