

proceedings, that is, the 20-minute maximum for speeches, by saying that I assume later today we will have a vote on the particular Bill.

• (1600)

What I want to do in the time available to me, because I have already had the opportunity to make the lead-off speeches, is to deal in a partial way with some of the reaction, comments and questions that have been raised during what has been a short debate on a very important piece of legislation. First, there is the suggestion that there will be unequal treatment between Canada and the U.S. We are opening up our border to the Americans but they are not doing the same for us. Let me quote from a piece of U.S. legislation:

(1) Whenever the Secretary of Transportation determines that the government of any country contiguous to the United States, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any such contiguous country, has engaged in unfair, discriminatory, or restrictive practices with a substantial adverse competitive impact upon United States motor carriers of property with respect to motor carrier transportation within such foreign country or political subdivision or between such foreign country and the United States, the Secretary shall seek elimination of such practices through consultations or other appropriate methods of representation.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when consultations or other methods of representation fail to result in the elimination of the unfair, discriminatory, or restrictive practices specified in paragraph (1), the Secretary may, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the United States Trade Representative,—

We all know who that is:

—suspend, modify, amend, condition, or limit operations by motor carriers from such foreign country or political subdivision in interstate or foreign commerce within the United States, if the Secretary determines such action is in the national interest.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, that indicates that if the U.S. Government wished, and if it felt our truckers were taking undue advantage by getting more than what the Americans consider our fair share of the haulage, particularly the back-haul, they could move very quickly to prevent us from having that access. That is one thing I wanted to point out to Hon. Members who have suggested that we have an even playing field. Quite clearly it is not. It is another reason that we should not move forward with this legislation and why it is important that the Bill be sent to the Transport Committee, not just to deal with it in terms of the Bill itself but to re-examine the whole issue.

During the opening remarks of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Kilgour) there was reference to a study, Cubukgil I believe is the name of it. That study confirms what the Canadian Trucking Association and what we have been saying all along. The Canadian trucking industry is highly competitive. The existing regulatory system has evolved to an open system, and rates and profit margins in trucking are as low as they can go without getting into destructive competition. In the meantime, Mr. Keith Thompson, who is the bureaucrat behind this, has been running around telling shipper groups how inefficient for-hire trucking is. It was certainly implied throughout *Freedom to Move* and ministerial statements that they had to deregulate to save

Canadian commerce because of the inefficiency of the transportation system. Having sold *Freedom to Move* on the basis that the regulated transport sector is inefficient, they now rely on the Cubukgil study to say that the trucking industry is so efficient and so competitive that it will not even notice deregulation and an open border. That is convenient, to say the least, but that does not stop the Parliamentary Secretary from jumping up periodically during the debate shouting "what about the shipper?" In terms of our ability to export et cetera he is trying to have it both ways.

On the question of the reverse onus test, we have said in this House that it is useless and goes well beyond the MOU with the provinces that we will have total deregulation as of January 1, 1988 and the so-called National Safety Code will not be in place for at least another two and probably three years, never mind whether it will be uniform or amount to a code. The assurances of the Parliamentary Secretary that we have learned from the American experience and will avoid the same pitfalls in safety is, in our opinion, quite meaningless.

The Motor Carrier Act of 1980 did not totally deregulate. It also contemplated a reverse onus test. However, that is not what happened because the ICC, Interstate Commerce Commission, lacked the will to use it and was swamped with applications by truckers desperately trying to protect their flanks by getting broad-based authority first, never mind new entrants. There is no reason to expect that the same thing will not happen here.

Another disconcerting note is that just a few weeks ago we were advised by a leading spokesman for the CITL that it had received assurances, from the same Mr. Thompson I spoke about earlier, that the reverse onus test language would not work and was only there because of the pressure from CTA and the MOU requirement.

As for the intervention of the chairman of the Committee on Transport claiming the committee was independent and under the new rules would bring in an objective report, let me add the following comments. The drafters of Bill C-127 and now Bill C-19 did not pay much attention to the standing committee's report on *Freedom to Move* with respect to the trucking aspect, let alone other areas. For example, the committee recommended strongly that there be something done with respect to international, and went so far as to suggest some sort of bilateral approach. Bill C-19 is silent on that, never mind that the former Minister of Transport had promised the CTA board the same thing. If the committee is independent, how can the Government dictate that it will not travel on such important legislation?

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, about specific reactions to comments from Hon. Members in this debate, and perhaps I will for a few moments.

Last spring while the Committee on Transport was still reviewing the general question of deregulation, a letter was sent to the chairman of the committee from an individual in Middleton, Nova Scotia. In the letter he refers to a study done