

The results of such a failure for Canada can be extrapolated from the U.S. experience. For as Professor John T. Dunlop has asserted in reviewing the U.S. scene: the inadequate consideration given to the question of "how deregulation would impact on the relevant labour markets and the process of collective bargaining "exacerbates the industrial relations problems created by deregulation.

[Translation]

It is clear that the government has failed to take into account this proposal made before the Transport Committee. And this is regrettable because there is no doubt that Canadian workers, in the transportation area, deserved more protection.

Now, I should like to deal briefly with the issue of foreign control over our industry. Always anxious to kowtow to our neighbours to the South, the government introduced a bill without any provision limiting foreign control over Canadian transportation companies. Mr. Speaker, this is surprising, when we know that even in a country as powerful as the United States, there is a 25 per cent limit on foreign takeovers in the transportation industry. We fear that a great many Canadian companies will fall into foreign hands. We said so to the government. We have tried to move amendments to protect against this possibility. But the Tory government has decided to live dangerously.

While disregarding the need to safeguard Canadian control over our transportation industry, leaving everything to the discretion of the Minister responsible for Investment Canada, and failing to set any statutory limit to foreign control, the government, we feel, has left the door open to foreign control over this industry which is so important to the economic well-being of Canada.

We have tried to move an amendment which could have offered a certain protection to the workers within the transportation industry by incorporating to Bill C-18 the provisions of the Labour Adjustment Benefits Act.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refresh the memory of some of our colleagues on this major legislation which was adopted by Parliament in May 1982. The purpose of this legislation, which comes under the Minister of Labour (Mr. Cadieux) is to extend protection through income support to some workers who have been permanently laid off by industries designated by the federal government, who are no longer entitled to collect unemployment insurance benefits and who have no employment outlook. These last resort benefits, authorized by the Labour Adjustment Benefits Act, are aimed at people who have been laid off and who, because of their age or particular qualifications, could not avail themselves of the manpower placement programs and who experience therefore tremendous adjustment problems.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that many railway and other Canadian transportation employees who worked for 20, 25, 30 or even 35 years in the industry will soon lose their jobs as a result of this deregulation process.

If in its great wisdom, the Government could in the past offer benefits to laid off workers of designated industries until

*National Transportation Act, 1986*

they reached the age of 65 so they would not rely entirely on welfare assistance, if the Government could offer such a useful program to textile, shoe, and mine workers in many areas of Canada, I think that it would only be fair to offer a similar treatment to transportation workers because these Government measures will undoubtedly create absolute chaos for many experienced workers.

If, for example, such a program had been set up for the workers at the CN shops in Moncton, we would not see as we do now, a Conservative member of Parliament being contradicted by his own Government after having declared that the Minister of Transport abdicated his responsibilities by allowing the Crown Corporation to go ahead and lay off many good workers from Moncton who spent many years working for the government. Well, these adjustment benefits have been in existence for several years and are helping many Canadians. In reality, these adjustment benefits account for about 60 per cent of the average weekly insurable earnings, based generally on the last 20 weeks of employment preceding the lay-off. These benefits are entirely geared to the inflation rate and are paid until the beneficiary finds a job or reaches the age of 65.

I therefore submit that the Conservative government has a responsibility towards all these workers that could be laid-off in the transport industry. The amendment I had moved which would have made it possible for these workers to take advantage of this program was of course rejected by the government. Yet, I think that sooner or later, in view of the slump that this bad legislation will eventually create, the government will have to intervene and I think that this program, however imperfect, could meet to a large degree some of the pressing needs of these workers who will be faced with unemployment and no job opportunities.

Another striking deficiency of Bill C-18 is the fact that it includes no qualification tying the enforcement of the legislation to the aims of regional development. We are now told at the very most that the commercial viability of transport services is to be weighed against the aims of regional economic development. It is an amendment which I introduced in the Committee on Transport, amendment that was reintroduced as such by my colleague the Member for Moncton (Mr. Cochrane) and that was also introduced at the same time in the Committee on Transport. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot but be pleased to see that the amendment was accepted. However, while I was pleased to have my amendment approved by the government, I must indicate that I find it insufficient. The amendment is not strong enough to compel the government and its officials to take regional development into account when decisions are made and transport policies are drawn up.

Mr. Speaker, history has clearly shown us that if we want an efficient regional development policy, all federal departments must take it into account. If the aims of regional development are only weighed against the commercial viability of transport services, there is no guarantee. It is too vague, too general for a minister or his officials to take that into consideration. The