

Government Orders

It is not part of Bill C-85. It is difficult for my party and I to understand the rationale behind that glaring omission.

Part VII reads:

This Part states the commitment of the Government of Canada to enhancing the vitality of English and French linguistic minorities in Canada and fostering the full recognition and use of both English and French in Canada.

The task of doing the above is given to the Department of Secretary of State. This department is given the right to encourage and co-operate with the provinces and the public in general to accomplish the mandate given to it by this statute.

We are asking on this side of the House why Part VII is omitted from Bill C-85 and thus the Department of Secretary of State is not permitted by legislation to carry out its mandate under this very important part.

I urge the minister who is present in the Chamber to reconsider the words he spoke earlier. In fact the Official Languages Act is absolutely not protected in three crucial parts of its 12-part mandate. That is not in keeping with the Prime Minister's so-called goals of national reconciliation, of somehow having peace between our linguistic duality, and of increasing the opportunities for all Canadians regardless of their ethnocultural extraction.

In this bill is an abandonment of those principles by virtue that it does not permit three of the twelve parts in our Official Languages Act to govern equality among our linguistic groups, and that is a shame.

In conclusion, we are very distressed on this side of the House that this government has allowed its perverse sense of decentralization as contained in this bill. Deregulation is the messiah of the Tory government for Canadians. Privatization is hurting the transportation industry and is hurting Canadians. It has not improved the transportation industry. It is sinking our shipping industry. It is derailing our trains. It is stopping and stifling our aircraft on the ground.

I have much respect for this minister. I hope that he still has time enough to turn things around. This government is going through some turbulent times. This bill will not improve it. This bill will aggravate it.

• (1620)

We will fight decentralization, deregulation, and privatization with every Canadian fibre that we have.

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I rise first to make it very clear to the hon. minister that members from this side of the House are unalterably opposed to privatization and deregulation in the method in which the minister and his government are introducing them.

However, when I listened to the minister and when I listened to my colleague from the Liberal side of the House, I was kind of concerned at the beginning because I had the feeling that we were indeed talking today about privatization and deregulation.

It is my understanding that the privatization and deregulation of airports are being done by regulation and not by this piece of legislation. This piece of legislation is talking about the workers and how the benefits, support and collective agreements of the workers will be protected.

This bill is entitled: "an act to provide for certain matters respecting official languages, employees' pensions and labour relations in connection with the transfer of certain airports." Having looked through the bill, having listened to the minister, and having listened to my colleague from the Liberal side of the House, it becomes more and more clear that the minister has cherry-picked his way through a number of pieces of legislation: the Official Languages Act, the Public Service Superannuation Act, the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act, the Canada Labour Code, Part I, and the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

I am very pleased that the minister has consulted those acts, but by naming these acts in this bill he has left workers feeling pretty high and dry in many areas.

The minister said that he is concerned and wants to provide for community input into Canada's airports through the local airport authority. I wonder if the minister also considers the representatives of the workers and the workers at airports part of the community. If indeed he does, I would like to ask the minister why he has consistently refused to discuss this legislation with representatives of the union. They tell me they have been trying to speak to him for two years on this legislation.

Mr. Lewis: I only brought it in a month ago.

Ms. Langan: The minister has said that he only brought it in a month ago, so how could he have had time to consult with the unions. It would seem reasonable and