

*National Transportation Act, 1986*

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member refers to rates which may or may not be charged to coal producers and others by the CPR at this time. That is precisely why we have the regulatory regime that we do. If these people have a complaint as to the fairness of what they are being charged, there are procedures in place for them to be able to make their case. That is as it should be, as far as I am concerned. If we open it up completely to the market-place and permit secret agreements to be reached between the CPR, or the CNR for that matter, and other producers, then we will have a rate system which discriminates against the less powerful producers and creates a hey-day for those who have the required volume to make sweetheart deals with the railways.

● (1550)

I realize it is kind of cute for the Government to get up and point out that in this case the New Democratic Party happens to be in agreement with a criticism made of this Bill by the Canadian Pacific. That is a fact. I can honestly say that it is not something I enjoy. But I prefer the truth over my own personal comfort. It happens to be the case in this case, and it is rarely the case that the CPR is right.

**Mr. Kilgour:** With all due respect to the Hon. Member who just spoke, the existing regulatory procedures do not work. They have been proven to be inadequate for the late 20th century on many occasions. I will give him an example of that.

Champion Forest Products, along with other pulpwood producers in western Canada, appealed the 4 per cent increase that CN, and I believe CP, put into effect last January 1. They filed their appeal with the CTC on, I believe it was, April 1 of last year. As the Hon. Member may recall, it was mid-December before the CTC came down with its decision. In other words, roughly eight months went by before the CTC made a decision.

Champion Forest Products as you well know, Mr. Speaker, is wanting to put up a \$350 million or \$400 million expansion to its pulpwood plant in Hinton in western Alberta. In the construction of this project some 400 workers would be employed full-time if that expansion goes ahead. I can tell the Hon. Member that Champion Forest Products is one of the many suppliers and western Canadian shippers which is strongly behind this Bill.

In other words the system has not worked, which is why we will change it to ensure that CP and CN have to negotiate in good faith with small, medium and large shippers on which hundreds of thousands of jobs in western Canada and throughout Canada, both urban and rural, depend. I am surprised that the Hon. Member does not seem to know anything about these issues.

The Hon. Member raised the question of small shippers. I would remind him, because he has not been here, and I should not mention where he has been, that shippers, small and large, will be able to negotiate rail prices and services as they do now with other suppliers of goods and services. Pricing will be open

to volume equipment service routing and other considerations. The point is that in the absence of confidential contracts, railways are hesitant to offer lower rates to small shippers where volumes may have a unique movement to offer to the railway which, perhaps, is of benefit to the railway because it fills an empty back haul. The Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) gave an eloquent example this morning of how the men and women of Fort McMurray tried to get a back haul route for the sulphur trains leaving Fort McMurray some years ago and were told that they could not have it.

When our legislation is in place, back hauls will be available to shippers and entrepreneurs in the Hon. Member's riding as well as in mine. With all due respect, the Hon. Member simply does not realize that the economy has changed since the days of the Regina Manifesto. We are trying to get into an era in which we have to compete with Japan and many other countries. The only way we can do that is by getting our goods and services moving with an efficient transportation system which is not captive to an outdated ideology.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Bird's Nest.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, I wish you would cut that out.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret that I had to say that, I am sorry. There is a problem with that particular part of Winnipeg and I regret that I have said that. I will now refrain from ever saying it again. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Birds Hill.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, I did not know that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Kilgour) was charged with the surveillance of Members of Parliament. He said that he would not mention where I was. If he knows where I was, then that is even more astounding. But I am not sure to what he was referring. The fact of the matter is that I was in Winnipeg for the first few days of this week with the federal NDP nuclear inquiry. If that is something of interest to the Parliamentary Secretary, then perhaps I could brief him on it. In the meantime he would do well to address his remarks to the subject matter.

He mentions, again facetiously, that the economy has changed since the Regina Manifesto. We are talking about amendments to the National Transportation Act of 1967, some 34 years after the Regina Manifesto. I am pointing this out just to show the shallowness and triviality of the type of response we get from the Parliamentary Secretary about a major change to our economy.

With respect to the question of how long it took this particular company to get a ruling out of the Canadian Transport Commission, that is a serious matter. But the disagreement is about whether or not the Government's response to that obvious problem is the right response. In my judgment it is no wonder the Canadian Transport Commission takes as long as it does to come up with judgments because it has been systematically underfunded for years, long before this