

*Motor Vehicle Transport Act, 1986*

environments and trying to get some type of national environment in order that traffic will be able to flow across the country. At a time when we are having discussions with another country to increase trade and facilities between the two countries, we have the interesting anomaly that in this country we still have the 10 jurisdictions which impede traffic. I do not wish to talk about the safety matter. I know that the Hon. Member did not intend to do it, because he is an even and responsible Member of the House, but the safety bogey is always raised like the goblins at Hallowe'en.

Every Minister of Transport, this Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and the Minister who brought in the *Freedom to Move* paper in the initial Bill, states, and it is also stated in the Bill if the Member would read it, and I know that he has read Bill C-19 from stem to stern, that safety will not be diminished at all. There is a different type of environment for regulation, but there will still be safety.

In terms of the American situation, it does cause concern. Regardless of the profit differential between the two countries, I am sure the Hon. Member knows that the interesting fact is that since deregulation in the United States, there are a thousand licences in the United States from Canadian trucking firms that are doing business there, and they have increased their market there by 8 to 12 per cent since deregulation in the United States. Would the Hon. Member answer this question that he has addressed, as have other Members? If that has happened in the United States with us competing in that larger market—and perhaps because of our dollar differential of 35 to 40 per cent, which certainly is quite an interesting advantage, we have been able to break into that market and increase our share—why should we be extra-concerned that we will not be able to keep our share in our own country?

**Mr. Hopkins:** I thank the Hon. Member for his question. He is a long-time Member of the House and has served very well many of these transport items.

In my talk I mentioned some of the inequities of the system as it is planned to be introduced into Canada. Why are Canadians doing so well in the United States? One, I mentioned fuel costs. They are already competing down there on a level with the same fuel costs. There is a larger volume of traffic in the United States, and there is more room to manoeuvre. Canadian companies are used to operating in a difficult climate with a greater overhead. When they go to the United States with more traffic, cheaper fuel costs, they are able to compete on an equal basis.

In Canada there are higher fuel costs, competition is in smaller communities without the volume of traffic. Rail lines are now serving certain areas well. When the competition starts in Canada, there will be regional development which is more poorly served by rail lines and by the trucking industry, because they will all try to get into the more crowded urban market of Canada. They will be in much the same environment there to compete as they are in the United States where there is exceptionally heavy traffic.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I regret that the Hon. Member's time has expired. Is there unanimous consent to give the Member two more minutes to complete his answer?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Hopkins:** In conclusion let me say that I hope that I have given the Hon. Member some food for thought. We can end this debate by saying that, given half a chance, Canadians can compete with anybody. If I were the Hon. Member, I would not put too much emphasis on the free trade talks. If this legislation does not go any better than the free trade talks, we will be in serious trouble.

● (1710)

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak for a few minutes on Bill C-19. Probably a good place to start would be with the statement made the other day by the Hon. Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse). He suggested that the Government was adopting a *laissez-faire* philosophy. Obviously that is what the Government is doing in this Bill, in Bill C-18, and in a number of other Bills which it has brought before the House with the intention of opening up a variety of industries to the free market. Basically that is the philosophy of the Government. It is actually returning to a previous structure which existed in the country, that is, a sort of dog eat dog market. The Government is removing protection by deregulating the industry. It will look the other way while industry fights with itself, eliminates itself, and eliminates service to Canadians. It is moving toward having less involvement in the distribution of goods. In doing that, the Government is condemning certain industries in certain parts of the country to a gradual but inexorable death.

If we do not have a transportation structure which allows the hinterland or the more remote areas of Canada to ship whatever goods they produce to market, particularly the central markets of Canada and of the United States with which we do considerable trade, those areas gradually shrivel up and die. A certain amount of this is already going on in remote areas.

Truckers are very concerned about Bill C-19, respecting motor vehicle transport, because they have seen what happened south of the border. Some of the larger and more able companies went into the United States. They have been watching what happened there. They know that there is a possibility, or a fairly good chance, that the same kind of thing will happen in Canada, since we are following the lead of the United States in deregulation. They have watched the devastation of that trucking industry in many ways and the concentration that has come about to save companies which could be saved.

There have been massive lay-offs in the United States. A large group of truckers or people related to that industry have