

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Kenora—Rainy River (Mr. Parry) Agriculture—Production of Ethanol from grain. (b) Possible alternative market for grain; the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart)—Social Security—Tax reform—The Elderly—Government position. (b) Income tax—The Elderly, Government position; The Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway)—Administration of Justice—Public Faith and confidence—Request for changes to parole system.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT, 1986

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-18, an Act respecting national transportation, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next motion will be Motion No. 9 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-18, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 36 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"so far as practicable, and with consideration to duties performed in the public interest, bears a fair propor—"

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the motion moved by my colleague and seconded by myself is to provide some fairness. The clause reads, as it exists in the Bill:

(c) each carrier or mode of transportation so far as practicable bears a fair proportion—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member. The motion has been moved by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). The Member should realize that if he does not speak now he cannot speak.

National Transportation Act, 1986

Mr. Benjamin: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Angus: We worked that out ahead of time, Mr. Speaker.

One of the things we are trying to do is to make sure that we are fair and reasonable in handling this Bill. The points that we want on record we will put on the record, but we will not do so at great length. I will be the only speaker from my Party on this motion.

Let me read the existing clause and then point out the changes:

(c) each carrier or mode of transportation, so far as practicable, bears a fair proportion of the real costs of the resources, facilities and services provided to that carrier or mode of transportation at public expense—

Although the Order Paper that I have in front of me has a different version of the amendment, what we are adding is that no single carrier or mode of transportation will bear, so far as practicable, a greater proportion of the real cost of the resources, facilities and services provided to that carrier or mode at public expense than any other single carrier or mode of transportation is required to bear.

As some Members of this House know, we had a very long fight over another piece of legislation, namely, Bill C-75. Clause 4 of that Bill gave the Government of Canada the authority to impose user fees for Coast Guard services. We fought that clause and we won. The Government eventually dropped that clause, and the Government is now consulting with the industry.

One of the things we learned during the course of the debate and the research that was done by Members of this House and by interested groups is that clearly there was not a balance out there. We had, for example, in one particular year on the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence Seaway 75 per cent cost recovery. In other words, the users of those government services, whether port facilities, the Seaway, pilotage or whatever, paid for 75 per cent of those costs. On the other hand, we are told that in air transportation only 40 per cent of the cost of the government services provided to air users is recovered in the form of user fees.

Very simply, what we want to do is to ensure that there is balance, that no one sector is forced to pay more than any other, even if it means a full examination of the whole question of cost recovery and the methods used. But we on this side of the House feel it is important, if we are to prevent unfair competition between modes, that we as a Parliament of Canada and as the Government ensure that there is fairness.

I am sure there are those on the other side of the House who would argue, "Yes, we will do it, 100 per cent for everybody". But that kind of thinking has no bearing on reality. Members know that those sectors cannot afford a 100 per cent cost recovery.

Add to that the comparison between the trucking industry, using national highways, provincial highways paid for by public expenditures—yes, with some cost recovery through