

hinterlands of Canada will have to pay greater amounts of money because they have the greatest amount of smaller commuter feeder airlines, which means that those costs will be passed on to the travelling public.

It has been estimated that in regions such as Atlantic and western Canada the travelling public will pay upward of 25 per cent more for their tickets of airlines' smaller Dash-8 service as a result of those airlines having to pay greater amounts of dollars to land at the respective airports. For instance, in St. John's the Dash-8 increase will be 32 per cent. In Gander, it will be 12.7 per cent and in Deer Lake, a 57.2 per cent increase in landing fees. In Goose Bay, there will be a 67 per cent increase in smaller aircraft services compared to larger jumbo jets with increases of upward of 10 per cent in metropolitan Toronto through Pearson airport.

Is this the government's idea of equity across the country? Is this the way it will balance the needs and aspirations of Canadians who do not happen to live in the large urban centres? Is that what the government means when it talks of a policy of regionalism? I would suggest that it is an absurd view of this country that not only will not work, but will not be acceptable to and tolerated by Canadian citizens across the country.

It is for those reasons that I am opposed to the general benchmark of decentralization, deregulation and privatization policies of this government. The dreaded DDP, decentralization, deregulation and privatization. They are linked. You cannot look at one without isolating and looking at the others. Therefore, in terms of the specific concerns on Bill C-85, we have a two-track approach; we have to link them with the other policies that have been enunciated and also begin to cross the *t,s* and dot the *i,s* in terms of what it means to local authority transferships.

Number one, what about the responsibility of safety and security? We have had the experience under deregulation. Does this mean now that in a transfership to local authorities that the security and safety aspects of all types of transport modes will be sacrificed? If it is, is it worth the price of transferring holus-bolus authority to local communities and local cities? I think not.

Government Orders

No. two. What about the guarantee of job security? We have seen the results in terms of deregulation and privatization. Does this mean now that in the transfership of local authority, we are also transferring the guarantee that has normally been there in terms of job security, particularly now that this government has finally admitted that we are currently in a recession?

Bill C-85 does not satisfy the conditions in terms of job security for airport employees. New managers will have full control over the work force. If they were to decide, for instance, that 20 employees are going to be laid off, a simple six-month notice is all that is required. Because Transport Canada is inclined to focus on maximizing service to the public, a higher number of employees are often required and the fact of protecting those jobs is certainly a higher priority under a national government control. Although the collective bargaining process and agreement will remain in place, the bargaining power of individual members affected by the transfer will be greatly reduced.

The Union of Canadian Transport Employees, for instance, which represents most of the airport employees, presently numbers a membership of 12,000 strong.

• (1610)

This represents, Mr. Speaker, logically—and you are a man of logic, unlike many of your colleagues—a strong bargaining case. For example, if Edmonton was to transfer the authority from the federal government to the local authority, the membership there would be reduced to 125 people, therefore greatly reducing their bargaining power.

If you are an employee and part of a membership of 125 or if you are an employee and part of a membership of 12,000, and someone has to speak for you, which one would you as an employee choose? Obviously, you would choose the larger one because they are interested, unlike members who yell.

I look forward to the members having the courage to get up in their place and speak. Maybe they are not concerned with employees protecting their jobs, but the Canadian people are certainly interested because they have to make ends meet at the end of the month.