

National Transportation Act, 1986

We know some of these answers from the experience in the United States. This is why it needs to be studied. We know that similar legislation to deregulate in the United States was brought in and that 150,000 jobs were lost in the railway sector. We also know that rail service to communities off the beaten track suffered. Great pressures were put on workers to accept poorer working conditions and, I am sure, to accept poorer wages and benefits. Safety conditions also suffered.

In Canada 11 labour organizations appeared before the committee that studied the *Freedom to Move* White Paper and expressed concern over substantial job loss and reduced wages which result from deregulation. My office has contacted labour unions in British Columbia which confirm and share these concerns.

I should like to explain quickly another concern of mine, that this kind of deregulation does not protect communities. If the CTC is removed, as proposed in the Bill, the risk of hazardous goods blowing up in our communities is even greater. I explained recently that the transfer point for dangerous goods was routed into Vancouver East, in the most densely populated part of downtown Vancouver, Chinatown. We do not intend to allow it to stay there, but unfortunately it will be very difficult to get it out of town, where it should be. If we are having difficulty with the CTC, how much more difficult will it be when there is no such organization with the authority?

Finally, I am also very concerned about the impact of deregulation on the jobs of women. I have talked with a number of women who work in the airlines. They are very concerned because they are the ones who are first to go. The majority of workers in the airline industry are women, and it is women who will suffer the job loss. The Canadian airline industry employs 40,000 people, most of whom are women. I also know of women who have families and may be forced by deregulation to move to other communities, especially from smaller communities. We have experienced that already in the interior of B.C. They will be told that they will either move to another area, leaving their families and communities behind, or they will be unemployed. That is the choice they will have. Those who still have their jobs will face lower pay, reduced benefits, less job security, and so on. Women are always the ones who are on the lower end of the job scale in these industries. I challenge the Minister responsible for the status of women in this area. Coincidentally, she is also responsible for privatization. I think there is a real conflict in those roles. Privatization also does away with the jobs of women. I challenge her to conduct a special study of the impact upon women's jobs of both deregulation and the sell-out in privatization of important services which rely upon women in many of the jobs.

I think my time is almost up—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will give the Hon. Member 30 seconds to wind up.

Ms. Mitchell: I appeal to my colleagues, particularly to the Government, to support the amendment to delay the Bill so that there can be intensive studies using the experience of consumers and people who know something about the impact of deregulation in the United States so that we can ensure that we are going in the right direction before we deregulate our transportation industry.

• (1600)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine) I would like to inform Hon. Members that on Monday, February 2, when Orders of the Day are called on Bill C-18, there will be 10 minutes remaining for questions and comments if the Hon. Member wishes to take them.

May I remind the House that from now on, under Standing Order 55(2), speeches will be of 10 minutes' duration. The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme).

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, may we dispose of the 10 minute question period today?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): We are going into Private Members' Hour. We cannot do that. The Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine) on a point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Fontaine: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A few minutes ago, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) said I was a paranoid. According to *Petit Robert*, this is a very questionable and derogatory term and I feel almost certain the Hon. Member did not really intend that.

Mr. Prud'homme: Read the definition to see if it applies.

Mr. Fontaine: Paranoid, its says here this is related to paranoia!

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. In the spirit of Friday afternoon, I am sure the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) will retract the statement he made calling the Hon. Member paranoid or whatever. I would hope that he will retract that statement.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Chair or my hon. friend took exception to what I said. I did not say the Member had paranoia. I just wanted him to be examined for a case of extreme paranoia.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Benjamin: If that offends my hon. friend and the Chair—I have been called a lot worse than that around here and sometimes people might have been right—and if my friend is that thin skinned and feels hurt, I will be happy to withdraw.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!