

National Transportation Act, 1986

Motions Nos. 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 18, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 36, 38, 39, 45, 55, 65, 66, 82, 92 and 96 will not be selected for debate and will not be put to the House.

Motions Nos. 21, 23, 35, 41, 42, 43, 48, 51, 85 and 97 have been ruled out of order.

Motions Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21A, 22, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 40, 44, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 52A, 52B, 53, 54, 54A, 56, 56A, 57, 57A, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67 to 81 inclusive, 83 to 84B inclusive, 85A to 91 inclusive, 93, 94, 95 and 98 will be put to the House for debate as outlined in this statement.

In closing, I think Hon. Members and certainly the public observing this would want me to express the appreciation of all Hon. Members for the very hard work that has gone into working out the appropriate and proper procedure for handling this number of motions. I want to tell the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet), the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), the Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud), and others how much that is appreciated by the Chair.

The House will now resume debate on Motion No. 4.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland—Kent): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt in the minds of Hon. Members that you have spent enough time examining and deciding on the motions submitted to you. We wish to thank you for all the attention you have devoted to this decision.

I do not hesitate to support Motion No. 4 moved by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) because I feel that if it were approved, it would eliminate predatory rates, because the introduction of such predatory rates within the industry could cause some transportation firms, mostly the smallest and the weakest, which cannot face a non-competitive market, to disappear. Such rates would push them out of business.

[*English*]

This motion seeks to avoid predatory pricing, a situation that could drive a number of small transport companies out of business and allow bigger operators to capture a larger share of the market. Of course, if this were to happen it would lead to higher prices for the same services. The motion is very important and I invite all Hon. Members to support it. It reinforces Section 112(2) of the present Act which says that every rate shall be compensatory.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, you might very well ask me: Why support such a motion if Clause 112 already takes this situation into account? Well, it is one more reason to support it, because it would reinforce the provisions of Clause 112 which provide that—

Every rate shall be compensatory.

But there is a clause a little further on which qualifies the term “compensatory”, and it is the purpose of the motion introduced by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) to prevent under any circumstances such rates from being non-compensatory and becoming predatory.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, during the hearings, we heard a number of witnesses who were deeply concerned about the security aspect of our transport system. We fear—in view of deregulation and the haste with which the Government seems to push that industry toward deregulation—that public security could eventually be jeopardized. I view the Hon. Member’s motion as something that would prevent some companies from being in a situation where they would have to reduce their costs and consequently give less consideration to security. And this could happen not only in road transport but also in other means of transport.

We also heard during the hearings several witnesses urging us to reflect on the present situation in the United States where deregulation was launched hastily and, in some cases, not enough consideration was given to security. We were also told that some accidents resulting in losses of lives had occurred recently and that we should examine what has happened during the last few years and take a second look at security problems.

Those are the reasons why, Mr. Speaker, I support the motion of the Hon. Member for Regina West and ask all the members of this House when they vote on this motion to keep in mind the security of all Canadians.

[*English*]

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate on this question I recognized that this amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) is a very wise one. In northern Ontario, communities have been served by carriers, in the airline industry for example, which have provided service for a considerable number of years and established a rate structure and a load. Along with deregulation and so-called free enterprise operations have come other carriers which have completely destroyed that structure. They drove the original carriers out of business. The rates increased and service became very infrequent. That is a destruction of the transportation system.

● (1200)

We have seen that happen in northern Ontario with rail and freight service. We have seen freight structures which discriminate against communities and regions which are resource-based. In fact, the rate structures are such that it is cheaper to ship out raw resources than to ship out the finished product.

Therefore I recommend to the House the adoption of the amendment of the Member for Regina West. I think it is eminently wise and would enhance the Bill considerably.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?