## National Transportation Act, 1986

big guys are not going to be able to get away with the things they have been getting away with because there will always be that threat of competition. That is the way it should be.

I know, Sir, why the NDP and Liberals want to restrict economic enterprise to a few big organizations in Canada. They do not like little guys. They are scared of thousands of Canadians running around doing their own thing, making their own deals, buying and selling amongst themselves with no Government telling them what to do. I know why they want just a few big corporations in every field of endeavour, whether it be energy or transportation. It is a lot easier to eventually nationalize five or six big companies than it is to take over hundreds or thousands of little guys. That is why they are always arguing in favour of the big corporations. Liberals, in their political philosophy, might not want to take over ownership of the means of production and transportation, but they certainly want to control it. They want to keep that iron grip. Therefore we have the Liberals and socialists together arguing in favour of continued regulation.

I will give you a couple of examples of this. The town where I live is an exporter of arsenic. It is hauled away by truck from the City of Yellowknife down to somewhere in Georgia. It is a hell of a good business for a little trucking company to get into. However, a little trucking company cannot do it because it has to go through several Canadian provinces and several U.S. states to get from the Northwest Territories to Georgia. Only a large international trucking company can bid on a contract like that. What the Government wants to do is have a system where the little guy has a chance to bid on a job like that. At present he is prevented from doing so.

I have seen this in small communities in my riding which have no road access and where somebody wants to start an air service. They want to buy themselves a Cessna 185 or a little Beaver and provide air service where none now exists. If you want to charter a plane you have to pay to ferry it from its original point to where you are, then to where you want to go, and then pay again to ferry it back. I have seen it made impossible for people to start up an air service because existing corporations based in other towns have gone to the ATC and blocked the setting up of an obviously advantageous air service for the people who live in these small communities. We heard examples of towns like Brantford and Red Deer, the kind of medium-sized town not particularly well serviced at the present time. With deregulation it would be a lot easier and simpler for an air carrier to set up in those towns and start servicing them on a regular basis. Deregulation has been put into effect in the U.S. but here in Canada, because we have not changed the legislation, the Government has not been applying the existing law in all its rigour.

I have a few final comments about the north-south line which divides Canada. We will have one system of more or less complete deregulation in the south and a continued form of regulation north of the line. In this respect I believe the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap had a good point. He said if one argues that deregulation is best south of the line, should

one not also argue that deregulation is better north of the line? Alternatively, if one is of the other opinion, the same ought to apply.

• (1220)

Why do we need this line? That is a question that troubles me. My opinion is that we do not need that line. I believe that deregulation is best both in southern Canada and in northern Canada. However, I know that a number of operators and municipalities have argued that they want to keep a system in the north for some time, on a kind of experimental basis. If the deregulation works well in the south, then the line can be eliminated later. That may not be bad because in that instance, the reverse onus would be in effect.

In conclusion, I want to go firmly on the record as being in support of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) and the deregulation system for Canadian transportation that he has so wisely brought before the House.

[Translation]

Mrs. Thérèse Killens (Saint-Michel—Ahuntsic): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part today in this debate on Bill C-18, to amend the current national transportation legislation which was first implemented in 1967. I deplore the fact that before introducing this Bill on November 4, the Government chose to ignore the quite legitimate claims of dozens of organizations representing thousands of Canadians.

Again, the Government overlooks the results of a democratic process just as it did in the case of Bill C-22, concerning pharmaceutical products, totally disregarding the recommendations of Professor Eastman. In both cases, Canadian consumers will foot the bill for this Conservative Government's indifference.

I should like especially to emphasize the shortcomings of this Bill concerning the transportation of handicapped people. The House will remember that in 1981, the Special Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped, on which I had the honour to sit, submitted ten recommendations dealing with transportation in Chapter VIII on its *Obstacles* report.

The two major objectives of the International Year of the Handicapped, I should like to remind the House, were: equality, participation and full integration.

Our report was entitled *Obstacles* for a precise purpose. Having heard over 600 briefs, we wanted to make the Government and the Canadian public aware of the special needs of the handicapped in each and every area which affects their daily lives, namely, human and civil rights, employment, income, information and communications, housing, independent living, public access to facilities and buildings, transportation, recreation, education, aids and devices, consumerism institutional living, changing attitudes, prevention, research and development, data base development, Native population, international perspective and finally funding and implementation.