The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I believe there has been consultations. The hon. member for Kamloops.

Mr. Riis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations and certainly we are in agreement with the motion as presented by the parliamentary secretary.

As a matter of clarification, I want to put something on the record. Assuming that there are no recorded votes, and it is my understanding that there would be no recorded votes later in the day, that if there were necessity, we would have an understanding that we would not see the clock to allow one or two members to complete their remarks if it had to go beyond five with the understanding, very clearly, that there be no recorded motion.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, if I have the assurance that there would be no requirement for recorded votes, in other words everything would pass either on division or by agreement, then I do not see a problem from our side and we would be happy to co-operate with members to make sure that everybody had their due say.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, we have no difficulty with this proposal. We give the undertaking that every member who wants to speak will at least be given a chance to speak, that nobody will hog the floor for the regular 40 minutes that are normally allowed at second reading. I think that people will be reasonable and will try to get this bill passed tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent point that my hon. friend from Ottawa—Vanier raises, that in the spirit of passing this important legislation prior to Remembrance Day, there will be an understanding that while speeches could be longer, we would attempt to hold them to about 20 minutes at second reading stage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Members have heard the terms of the motion. Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Agreed and so ordered.

[*Translation*]

AIRPORT TRANSFER (MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS) ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-85, An Act to provide for certain matters respecting official languages, employees' pension and labour relations in connection with the transfer of certain airports.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate on Bill C-85, although I would have preferred to hear my friend and colleague from Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, who today is celebrating 25th anniversary as a member of this House. As you know, Mr. Speaker, today the Hon. Warren Allmand is being honoured in his riding and is therefore unable to be in the House. He asked me to make a few comments on this bill, reserving the right to add further comments later on and perhaps expand on, and further explain, our objections to certain clauses in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Bill C-85 is to provide for certain matters respecting official languages, pension plans and labour relations.

[*English*]

I shall leave my colleagues and friends on the Liberal side of the House to handle questions dealing with the protection of employee benefits, as to whether the government will ensure that employees do not lose their pensions and pension benefits once the local authorities have taken over airport management.

We have to remember that when CN decided to privatize Route Canada all employee benefits and pensions were lost due to mismanagement. I will leave that to some of my colleagues who are much more familiar with the issues.

We have an issue here dealing with the protection of jobs. The government must again ensure that all jobs at local airports are retained once they are under local management. We have in our minds the privatization of Air Canada. We all remember the Deputy Prime Minister in this House assuring us that the jobs would be protected. In October 1990, 2,900 people lost their jobs and had no federal protection. I will also leave to some of my colleagues in the Liberal caucus the obligation to oppose this bill based on what kind of guarantee local