

else including legislators and legislative assistants. Yet the Opposition has the nerve to suggest that the highways are not self-supporting. You and I, Sir, know that right across Canada, the highways are self-supporting because of the taxes charged against those who drive on them. We ought to realize that if the highways are a better method by which goods can be moved from one place to another, they should be used.

The philosophy of this Bill is a philosophy that tells a shipper to do it the way he wants to do it. It tells him that if he can ship it by road cheaper, he should ship it by road; if he can ship it by rail cheaper, he should ship it by rail; and if he can ship it by air cheaper, he should ship it by air. If that guy will not do it for him, he should get someone else to do it. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with giving people freedom? Is there something wrong with freedom that would cause members of the New Democratic Party to say: "No, no, don't give us freedom", or that would cause that great Liberal Party to say: "Freedom is not for us, freedom is for civil servants only"?

Members of the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party are demanding the *status quo*. They want us to make sure we preserve branch lines that do not work. They are saying: "Make sure that if it went by one trucking company 20 years ago, the same trucking company maintains the monopoly; make sure that if it went by one airline once, that same airline will forever maintain the monopoly". It is a policy of *status quo* and monopolies. It is a policy of protecting vested interests.

What are those vested interests? We know that the vested interest of the Liberal Party is big business. Only big business contributes to the Liberal Party. Let us talk about the vested interest of the New Democratic Party. As we all know, the New Democratic Party is supported by donations and contributions, forced or otherwise, from the unions that look after the rights of workers working for established companies. The unions do not want any competition. If a new guy on the block comes along and says that he can do it cheaper, that might mean that some of the union members will have to work for the new guy who has not yet been certified. That might mean that the unions might receive fewer contributions. Is that not too bad?

Canadians should be frozen in ice because of the attitude of the New Democratic Party. Where is the "new", where is the "democratic"? Where is the freedom? How is the little guy being protected?

Sir, you and I both know that the New Democratic Party has not had a new idea since 1935. In this particular case, it is doing what it can to prevent the development of this country and to make it more expensive for people to ship coal, potash or lumber. Every time goods are made more expensive, the person buying those goods must pay more for them, or perhaps not even buy them at all. That means that people are put out of work and workers cannot get raises. That means that Canada is not as wealthy as it should be. Members of the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party, through this

filibuster, are rising to ensure that Canada is not as prosperous as it could be.

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Saint-Henri—Westmount): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments on this Bill and I would also like to take issue with some of the drivel, amusing though it was, of the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn). We should have him here more often to provide a little comic relief. At least he breaks away from the routine speeches prepared by the Tory caucus research branch. On financial matters, the Hon. Member for Mississauga South has occasionally shown some spirit of independence. We certainly did not see that this afternoon while he was speaking on transportation matters.

The Hon. Member first ignored something which he should know since he has been around this place long enough, and that is, that regulatory reform as opposed to deregulation—and there is a difference—in the transportation industry was begun by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), when he was the Minister of Transport.

● (1640)

The Hon. Member talks about new ideas with the notion of making our national transportation system more efficient. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry had already embarked on that course of action and undertaken a reform package when he was rudely interrupted in 1984. However, with what we have seen to date from the Government, undoubtedly we will in due course have the opportunity, the challenge and the responsibility of finishing the job we began in 1984 of bringing a more rational and up-to-date transportation policy to this country. Therefore, when the Hon. Member across the way accuses us on this side of the House of not being prepared to move from the *status quo*, he is patently abusing his own memory as well as those of us who were here at the time, including you, Mr. Speaker.

We began this exercise but we did it in a sensible, measured way. We began by recognizing that there are a lot of good things in our national transportation system. We began by recognizing that massive deregulation of the kind contemplated in this Bill is not necessarily in the interests of the transportation sector, its users, employees, the regions or the domestic economy.

I have noted that when the Government presents its argument it speaks of course to the benefits of deregulation such as efficiency, profitability and so on. However, one thing we have learned over many years, which the Government has not yet learned, is that every single government program of any kind has costs and benefits. There is an asset side to the balance sheet and a liability side. It is the duty of the Government not simply to promote the benefits of a particular kind of program but to analyse carefully the costs to those adversely affected by a particular program and address that issue in its legislation. Yet the Government has repeatedly failed to do