Supply

The key thing is we need some stability. Carriers have to be assured of a decent return. In doing so, we then ensure that they can afford to pay for the kind of maintenance we need, the kind of safety we need, the kind of services we need.

Let me turn now from air to trucking. We saw a separate piece of legislation in this House deregulating trucking and parallel action in the provinces to also deregulate trucking. I found that whole aspect quite ironic because as a provincial member of the legislature in Ontario in 1976, I was part of a select committee that studied trucking deregulation in Ontario. Deregulation never occurred there under the Conservatives, but as a result of what the federal Conservatives did here, the provincial Liberals agreed and followed through with deregulation.

What we saw happening in trucking was in a way a microcosm of what happened in air. We saw the emergence of a whole bunch of new truckers. A lot of the independents that for years were operating illegally became legal. They had the ability to get out and make a buck. A lot of new ones came in, again with the same test. If you can convince your banker, you can buy a rig and you can go out and hustle for the work.

We raised expectations and a lot of mom and pop operations developed, that independent spirit. What happened was that the industry grew too fast. There were more trucks than there was cargo, so costs became a factor. We saw outside this House the place was almost surrounded by rigs. We saw in Windsor the bridge between Windsor and Detroit shut down because of truckers who were angry at the inability of governments to assist them. They were angry that there was not enough work for them. They saw their limited cargo access being siphoned off to American truckers because they have different tax laws, different write–offs and what have you.

We created a situation where we had gone from a regulated environment where there were some controls on the number of trucks as a way to guarantee quality of service, a restriction on the quantity of service so that the number of trucks on the road matched the cargo that was available, so that there was a good bottom line that those who were in business had a decent return. Yes, they tend to be larger companies, almost back to that point where a

lot of the independent operators are now locked into contracts with a major company. They are finding themselves no better off as a result of that.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I have limited time left. In conclusion, the motion that we put forward not only is a statement about deregulation itself, but is also an indication that this government has failed to recognize that its philosophy did not work. It did not create more competition, it did not create more jobs; it did the opposite: less jobs, less service, less safe operations.

I know it is time to turn things around again and provide some stability in our air industry, our trucking industry and in our rail industry, which I have not even got to because of the time available. If we do not then what is happening to Canadian Airlines is going to happen to CN, CP, Air Canada and our trucking companies. More and more they will be bought up and controlled by individuals and companies south of the border.

I would like to leave you with just one parting word. The reason that this country developed as it did in an east-west mode was because of the foresight of our first Prime Minister who said we had to have those connections. By deregulation, we have lost those connections entirely.

Mr. Felix Holtmann (Portage—Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to be involved in this debate on the opposition motion this morning.

I listened intently to a colleague of the House defending this motion which deals with deregulation. It does not surprise me that he and his party would be opposed to deregulation because they are basically opposed to privatization of most things. They would like the government of the country to own all transportation, to basically be involved in a major way in the activities of trucking and rail. In other words, it is the socialistic view that he presents in his place. Although we never talked about that part of it, his view is quite simple. It is that private enterprise should not be into transportation.

• (1050)

He shakes his head, but if he had heard what he said this morning, he is opposed to deregulation which allows for the private sector to invest in the transportation industry not to be dictated by the government. But in fact, in his case it would be.