

National Transportation Act, 1986

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I believe that in his speech the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) referred to the matter of safety in the various transportation systems in Canada. I think it is very important to stress the fact that special attention was given to the matter of safety all along this reform process. The now Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) and his predecessor very clearly stated that one of the priorities of the reform is agreement over a higher security level for each of our means of transportation. New provisions for the operating of airlines and trucking companies expressly recognized that carriers should meet safety standards, failing which they would lose their operating licenses.

Recent amendments to the Aeronautics Act and the forthcoming adoption, for the very first time, of a National Safety Code, are proof of the Government's unconditional commitment to the trucking industry in this respect. Mr. Speaker, this is very important. Over 30,000 people will be involved and \$1.2 billion, nearly one third of the combined budgets of Transport Canada and the CTC, will be budgeted annually for enforcement of the safety code.

The Minister has also announced his plans to hire an additional 100 inspectors who will be working in safety enforcement.

Our regulatory reform, and this is very important, is purely economic and does not in any way affect existing safety measures.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, it was the Canadian Airline Pilots Association that said that deregulation would have a disastrous impact on safety. It is not something I made up myself. It has been said by safety experts in various fields. However, it is possible that with a certain degree of deregulation, if it is done reasonably, carefully and intelligently, if that is not too much to ask of our friends opposite, we could still guarantee a fairly high level of safety. However the Bill in its present form provides no guarantees for this, and the only thing that is clear from this Bill is the Government's ulterior motives, and on the basis of our experience in other areas, this means the big guy always wins, jobs will be lost, and there will be no safety at all in—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member, but the period for questions and comments has now expired. Debate. The Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp).

[English]

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join in the debate on Bill C-18, to speak in support of the motion of my good friend, the Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), which amends the Government motion to read:

Bill C-18, an Act respecting national transportation, be not now read a second time but that the Order be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Transport.

That is a sound and sensible proposal. The amendment recognizes the fact that that which the Government is putting before Parliament will have enormous consequences. It recognizes that the Transport Committee had inadequate time to consider the proposals of the Government and was not given the opportunity to travel to various parts of Canada to allow Canadians to respond to the Government's proposals. The amendment recognizes that the Standing Committee on Transport did not have the opportunity which a parliamentary committee deserves to explore the possible consequences of the Government's *Freedom to Move* proposals and recommend sound action to Parliament.

In suggesting that the amendment is sound and that it would be an opportunity for the Parliament of Canada to have a further opportunity in committee to consider the proposals, it is appropriate for me to provide as justification some defence of it from a consideration of transportation in Canada and North America. The curious thing about this proposal for the deregulation of transportation is that it reeks of commitment to a principle which has not been carefully thought through, the application of which is likely to have very different consequences from those suggested by the Government.

There is certainly a desire by some shippers to have the competitive situation which the Government hopes will result from its proposals. I have received letters and briefs from several major industries operating in northern Ontario and other parts of the country. Those interests think that the change in the regulatory regime prevailing in Canada could be to their advantage. I will not name those interests because what I want to say in considering the validity of that view may well be mistaken by them. I will, therefore, leave them anonymous.

It is sad that far too little is known of the history of transportation in this country, particularly that which occurred 100 years ago. Very few Canadians remember now, if they ever learned, that John D. Rockefeller and his associates built the Standard Oil complex through confidential contracts and even worse practices against their competitors which destroyed competition in the petroleum industry in the American midwest and allowed Rockefeller and his associates to get complete control of it. Rockefeller made secret agreements with shippers and played one off against the other. He also brought pipelines into the system.

If you are able to do those things and are prepared to go even further in the war of competition by attacking your competitors' words, setting them on fire and so on, you can build a great industrial empire. That is exactly what John D. Rockefeller and his associates did. It is an odd thing for a Baptist layman who enjoyed teaching Sunday school to have done, but that is what he did. Rockefeller and his associates did that by making secret contracts with shippers and playing one off against the other. They got rock-bottom prices for moving their products because they guaranteed large shipments. In the process they drove their competitors out of business. It was in that context that the United States