

these bills are known as the freedom to move legislation. They are meant to send a message to Canadian business and the traveller. We are freeing the transportation sector from the shackles of heavy handed economic regulation.

Mr. Speaker, there are people who are concerned about where this Bill is going, and I heard the Hon. Member opposite speaking earlier about the concerns of the trucking industry. I would like to draw the attention of the House to an independent study on the effects of deregulation on the trucking industry that was ordered by the Canadian Conference of Motor Transport Administrators. The study concluded that gradual deregulation of market access and trucking charges has already brought about significant changes in the industry. The industry is really interested in our legislation.

This Bill will help destroy monopolies. Many people operating in remote areas did not have many outlets for distributing their goods. Our legislation gives them possible solutions. The Bill will prevent price fixing by carriers and secret deals, negotiations between various carriers. It will allow for *ad hoc* negotiations with each carrier from whatever part of the country, something that was not possible.

The Bill also will allow the integration of the various possible transportation services. In other words, trucking may be used in some areas and integrated with rail transportation. Previously, the legislation would not allow such adjustments, Mr. Speaker.

We will also see to it that changes are made to the Canadian Transport Commission. As we know, the existing legislation requires companies like Canadian National to provide services and make available facilities that are no longer useful to Canadians. That was already true under the Liberals and they never realized it, Mr. Speaker. Do you know that one third of Canada's railroads are used in only 1 per cent of CN's operations, and that another third of Canadian railroads are used only in 9 per cent of CN's operations?

All that means costs. Maintenance of light signals at each intersection, school buses and public carriers stopping at intersections knowing full well there no train ever comes—they have been stopping for years because of this obsolete Liberal legislation. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that in my constituency there is a track section that has not been used for years? People in those areas have constantly been making representations to have the track removed and the land given back to adjacent owners, so that school buses may cross the track without stopping, etc. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, that despite years of efforts to have that section removed, they never succeeded because of the indifference of our predecessors in this place?

All this means, Mr. Speaker, that consumers will have no reason to fear changes in the services we will be making available to the people. Services will remain the same, the only change will be to the way they are provided. We will simply modernize the way those services are provided.

National Transportation Act, 1986

Mr. Speaker, let me also comment on the Opposition's reaction and position. But first, I have one single point to make, because I had no opportunity for exchange with the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau), a Quebecer specializing in economic and financial affairs. I read something amusing, by way of an aside, Mr. Speaker, in this morning's *Le Devoir*,

Banking centre plan unacceptable, says Raymond Garneau.

I therefore found that very hard to swallow for Canadians. I say to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (M. Axworthy) who is concerned about employment that we have created 666 000 jobs since we came to power and that we shall create more, since we shall give Canadians opportunities to be more productive, to produce more and to sell more abroad.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, our legislation, because it lowers costs for consumers, because it increases our exports, because it makes industrial recovery easier in Canada and because it creates employment for all Canadians, must be passed swiftly and I hope we can count on the support of the Liberals. As for the support of the socialists, forget it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments. The Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet).

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow upon the comments made by the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine) who so kindly congratulated the ministers who took part in the preparation and drafting of this Bill.

He stated that we should congratulate the Minister of State for Transport. I would remind him that the Conservatives have been in power for over two years, that the Leader of the Conservative Party has stated before Montrealers that he would give back to Montreal its important status as metropolis of the country, that we have had three successive Ministers of State for Transport whose mandate was to settle the problem of Mirabel and Dorval airports.

Now the first Minister of State for Transport who was Member for Roberval (Mr. Bouchard) had promised that the matter would be settled immediately. He left and was replaced by the Hon. Member for Rosemont (Mrs. Blais-Grenier). The latter was more interested in travelling abroad and consequently she got lost somewhere along the Champs-Élysées so that the Dorval-Mirabel problem was never settled.

The third one, the Member for Saint-Jean (Mr. Bissonnette) who was also Minister of State, told us right away that—

Mr. Lanthier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Lanthier) on a point of order.

Mr. Lanthier: Mr. Speaker, I think the comments made by the Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) are totally irrelevant. The competence of the various Ministers of State for Transport is not being questioned, because some of them were exceptionally brilliant. But we are dealing with a bill. Consequently, it may be advisable to stick to the legislation.