

rules that are totally different from ours and this gives them a competitive edge. They are not subject as we are to statutes and regulations. So they can come here and sign contracts. They are not in the same competitive situation.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, when you have confidential contracts, you have increased competition and no control over the Americans who enter this country nor over their right to buy out our property, or to take over our routes.

● (1500)

[English]

—traffic routes. It is a moment of deep concern. That is why I support the motion to send the Bill back to committee for more study. The concept of deregulation is not a poor one, but it has not been carefully worked out. Our Canadian sovereignty and development should be first and foremost. While we are so busy selling off, deregulating, and allowing access to the United States and other countries, we should think of the social costs of putting our own people out of work. If that were calculated in, what would we end up with?

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, there is no section in Bill C-18 which deals with access. That is covered in the human rights legislation which will apply to this Bill.

With regard to the question raised by the Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet)—

[Translation]

The Hon. Member mentioned competition and I must tell him that in the United States, since deregulation, the number of jobs in trucking and in air transportation has increased rather interestingly.

[English]

This Bill requires three basic criteria to get a domestic air service licence. One of those is the requirement to be Canadian. At least 75 per cent of the voting interests must be owned or controlled by Canadians. Therefore, I think the Hon. Member's fears in that area are unfounded.

With regard to the railways, it is true that they must be viable, and we believe that they will be. However, for too many generations, especially in my part of the country, the railways have been living on the backs of the shippers and producers of potash, lumber, etc. In order to create more jobs in those sectors the railways must stop setting rates at the levels they choose, forcing the suppliers and shippers to pay what the railways can gouge out of them.

We are conscious of the concerns about the viability of the railways and believe they will be met. At committee we will listen to any representations on that issue. We accept, of course, that the railways must continue to be viable, but not to the point of preventing people from the other eight provinces to earn a living. I note that both of the speakers this afternoon are from the inner two provinces. People in the northern regions of Quebec and Ontario have rights too.

National Transportation Act, 1986

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will allow the Hon. Member to reply briefly.

Mrs. Finestone: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member is so comfortable with this Bill, what objection has he to going back to committee and hearing the Premiers of the provinces and leaders of the industry who are not of the same opinion as him, and then revising the Bill? I suggest that that is exactly what he should do.

● (1510)

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, in 1984, we received a very definite message from the population to reorganize the country and our industries, and to give Canadians better equipment for a better living, and I am happy to see that the now Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) was the first to propose a review of the Transportation Act. I would like to commend him, and also to commend a Quebecer who, as Minister of State for Transportation, visited part of the Province of Quebec, listening to the various people involved in transportation—and indeed I attended many of these meetings—and I would like also to commend my colleague for Annapolis Valley—Hants (Mr. Nowlan) who, as Chairman of our Transport Committee, also questioned many Canadians throughout the country, from east to west, from north to south. This team produced a document which contains our basic message, *Freedom to Move*. Before going any further I think I should sum up the principle and main point of our message, of our approach to this issue: Are Canadians there to serve the bureaucrats, or to be enslaved by public servants, legislation and procedural red tape as institutionalized by our Liberal predecessors? Or should it not be the other way around—bureaucrats at the service of Canadians, business people, consumers and buyers?

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is that the bureaucracy is there to serve us. We must be the masters of bureaucrats, not their slaves.

It used to be that management people anxious to improve the services offered by their transport company or to open a new transport business had to meet the requirements of a wide array of legislative constraints. They had to spend as much energy on simply getting permits as they would eventually do on offering their services, so we decided to get rid of this abusive legislation. Our Bill takes three major principles into account. First, the safety of the transport network remains our priority. Second, competition and market forces—words unheard of in Canada a few years ago—have to be the main factors of our approach aimed at providing less costly yet profitable, efficient and adequate transport services. And the third major principle: our policy is based on the fact that transport is a tool for regional and economic development.

The ultimate purpose of our legislation is lower prices for the Canadian consumer, and people have to understand that.