

For many years the Governments of the maritime provinces have advocated that the National Transportation Act should endorse the following regional development principles: First, transportation is recognized as a key to regional economic development; and second, where there is a conflict between regional economic development objectives and commercial viability, regional economic development must take precedence. Without a commitment to that second principle the development objectives of the first bear no weight and are of no significance whatsoever.

My third point has to do with jobs. Again we have to look at deregulation in the U.S. Some 30 labour organizations in Canada appeared before the committee and each expressed fear that the deregulation proposals would result in significant job loss, displacement or wage reduction. There is very little hard evidence available in Canada about the effects of deregulation. We just do not know what they will be. However, we do have the American experience.

It is indicated that in the U.S. some 40,000 workers in the airline industry have lost their jobs since 1980. Over the same time 150,000 jobs were lost in the railway industry. The trucking sector is somewhat more difficult to assess, but it is estimated that employment was reduced by as much as one-third. Somewhere between 250,000 and 300,000 union members were put out of work in that sector and they have not been replaced.

Direct job loss is one aspect of deregulation, but only one. Those who were able to retain their jobs have been under tremendous and persistent pressure to make concessions, to reduce their wages, to give up their hard won benefits, and to relax the standards of working conditions. As companies seek to cut costs in order to compete with one another the first people they turn to are their employees. The reduced cost to shippers being held out as a carrot by the proponents of deregulation is being paid for in very large part by the workers in the transportation industry.

There is no doubt that a new regulatory regime will create job dislocation and it is therefore imperative that this legislation, Bill C-18, contain some measures to deal with that. Because it does not, I say that this time allocation motion is not one that we on this side of the House and in this Party can accept.

● (1520)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being 3.19 o'clock p.m., the two hours provided for the consideration of the motion now before the House under the provisions of Standing Order 117 have expired. Accordingly, under the terms of the Standing Order, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the motion.

The question is the following one. Mr. Hnatyshyn (for Mr. Mazankowski) moved:

That, further to the notice given on Thursday, June 11, 1987, by the Deputy Prime Minister and the President of the Privy Council, and pursuant to the

National Transportation Act, 1986

provisions of Standing Order 117, in relation to Bill C-18, an Act respecting national transportation, four further hours be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and four hours to the consideration of the third reading stage of the Bill; and

That fifteen minutes before the end of the four hours allotted to the report stage consideration and to the third reading stage consideration of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this Order and, in turn, every question necessary in order to dispose of the stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say ye.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Hnatyshyn) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 151)

YEAS

Members

Blenkarn	Grisé	Merrithew
Bourgault	Gustafson	Minaker
Cadieux	Hamilton	Mitges
Caldwell	Hardey	Murta
Chartrand	Hawkes	Nicholson
Clark	Horner	(Niagara Falls)
(Brandon—Souris)	Hudon	Nickerson
Coates	Jepson	Nowlan
Collins	Joncas	Oberle
Cossitt	Kelleher	Ostrom
Côté	King	Plamondon
(Lac-Saint-Jean)	Ladouceur	Redway
Darling	Lanthier	Reid
Daubney	Layton	Ricard
Desjardins	Lesick	Schellenberg
Domn	Lewis	(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Edwards	MacDonald	Schellenberger
Fennell	(Kingston and	(Wetaskiwin)
Forrestall	the Islands)	Scott
Fraleigh	Malone	(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Fretz	Mantha	Scowen
Gérin	Marin	Stewart
Gottselig	Mazankowski	Taylor
Gray	McCain	Thacker
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-	McDermid	Towers
la-Madeleine)	McKenzie	Tremblay
Greenaway	McKinnon	(Lotbinière)