

*Motor Vehicle Transport Act, 1986*

interests of everyone in the House, regardless of which Party is in power. I do not like the idea of leaving that loophole, that there should be this kind of discretion, because there is a potential for patronage and ideology to become very important players in this vital sector of the Canadian economy. My Party and I find it totally unacceptable.

We have supposedly learned a lesson from the United States. Twenty-five per cent is its limitation on foreign ownership of American transportation companies. That is firmly in place. Could we not at least do that within our own Canadian perspective? Do we have no pride of self and no place to allow us to grow as Canadians in our own industry and on our own sovereign ground? It is becoming a little disgraceful.

There is potential for access saturation by American trucks into our country and very little legislation to stop that access. I thank the Hon. Member for asking his question because it is very serious and one of great concern.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the dignity which you bring to the chair. I can only describe the Hon. Member's presentation as excellent. She outlined the critical concerns about the legislation before the House. The Hon. Member will be aware that the legislation does not change a very peculiar situation which exists. When American bus lines come from the United States into Canada and their bus drivers are American citizens, they can drive to Chicoutimi, Banff, Calgary, or wherever. That is fine and probably as it should be. However, the Hon. Member will know that when Canadian bus companies with Canadian drivers go to the United States, they must stop at the border and take on American bus drivers to drive in the United States. Is it not rather one-sided; the Americans gain all and we gain nothing? Does that seem to reflect the general nature of the legislation about which she articulated this afternoon?

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for that question. It seemed to me that the Parliamentary Secretary suggested that there was no change in the new Bill in respect of bus transportation. However, that was no answer. Essentially, if they have been allowed total access and freedom in the territory of our sovereign country, that is fine, but we should have equal access and equal rights.

The problem with the Government is that it has forgotten that we do not kneel down or play dead. We must stand and be counted when it comes to that kind of access.

While I am on my feet I should like to add, if I may, a serious concern, when we talk about foreign takeovers and corporate concentration, about which the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan (Mr. Angus) asked earlier. My concern is best reflected in a study of industry concentration which should be a warning to us. I should like to refer to it, for the information of the House.

In 1978 in the United States, four of the largest interstate carriers had one-fifth of the market for freight. The 10 largest

had 39 per cent of the market, and the top 20 had 43 per cent. At that time the percentages already revealed a significant degree of economic concentration, considering that there were nearly 17,000 interstate motor common carriers of general freight in 1978.

Then came deregulation. What was its impact? By early 1985 the amount of interstate traffic carried by the four largest carriers had risen to 35 per cent. That was a 75 per cent increase over their previous 20 per cent share of the market. The 10 largest carriers had 60 per cent, which was a 70 per cent increase since 1978. The 20 largest had 67 per cent of the market, which was a 56 per cent increase since 1978.

The reason for these startling increases in concentration was that many carriers had to go out of business. They could not face the unfair competition and the cut-price rates which were being offered. There was just no ability for the others to survive. In addition, that is one of my concerns.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before recognizing the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Kilgour), I should like to indicate that there is one minute remaining.

**Mr. Kilgour:** Mr. Speaker, I may have erred yesterday. The reverse onus test will come into effect on January 1, 1988.

**Mrs. Finestone:** That is no good.

**Mr. Kilgour:** The fitness test will come into effect on January 1, 1991, a year after the safety code is in place.

Referring to the question raised by the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) about bus drivers, I have been informed that it is an immigration matter. It varies with the company. For example, Voyageur has an arrangement where some of its drivers drive right into the United States. The drivers of other bus companies which have not made arrangements with Immigration Canada have to get off at the border. I understand that it varies with the company and according to what arrangements they have with Immigration Canada.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary is new in his job, and I am fairly new to this dossier. He talked about reverse onus. I cannot help but respond with the following observation and a sense of caution, because I know he is a cautious man.

He said "I believe" and "as I understand it". He never once said that it was his opinion. It was always as he believed or as he understood. When he talks about reverse onus, which removes public convenience and necessity and replaces it with fit, willing and able, there is a great difference. First, one must prove the need to move into a territory and be competitive. The other is everybody for himself and dog eat dog, which leads to conflict with individual truckers, and we are in for real trouble. I think we must be very cautious before we move along that route.

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to wrap up this part of the