



House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 175

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Saturday, March 25, 1995

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Saturday, March 25, 1995

The House met at 9 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

MAINTENANCE OF RAILWAY OPERATIONS ACT, 1995

BILL C-77—ALLOCATION OF TIME

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wish to inform the House that an agreement has been reached by the majority of the parties in the House with respect to an allocation of time to the report stage and third reading stage of Bill C-77. Therefore, pursuant to Standing Order 78(2), I move:

That, in relation to Bill C-77, an act to provide for the maintenance of railway operations and subsidiary services, not more than three hours shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the said bill and not more than one hour shall be allotted to the consideration of the third reading stage of the said bill and, at the conclusion of the final allotted hour of consideration of each of the said stages of the said bill, any proceeding before the House shall be interrupted and every question necessary for the disposal of the stage then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Call in the members.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 180)

YEAS

Members

Alcock	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Barnes	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélanger
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	DeVillers
Discepolo	Duhamel
English	Finestone
Flis	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanrahan
Hickey	Hoepfner
Hopkins	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Patry	Peters
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Skoke
Speaker	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stinson
Szabo	Telegdi

Government Orders

Thalheimer
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young —131

Tobin
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood

NAYS

Members

Bachand
Bergeron
Bouchard
Caron
Crête
Debien
Deshaies
Duceppe
Fillion
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Jacob
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Ménard
Paré
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)—41

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Daviault
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guimond
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Nunez
Pomerleau
St-Laurent

PAIRED MEMBERS

Members

Allmand
Bellemare
Brien
Canuel
Dalphond—Guiral
Easter
Payne
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau

Asselin
Bernier (Gaspé)
Cannis
Culbert
Dupuy
Marchand
Peric
Ringuette—Maltais
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

(0945)

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare the motion carried.

* * *

MAINTENANCE OF RAILWAY OPERATIONS ACT, 1995

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-77, an act to provide for the maintenance of railway operations and subsidiary services, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): There are 42 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-77, an act to provide for the maintenance of railway operations and subsidiary services.

Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39 and 40 will be grouped for debate.

A vote on Motion No. 1 applies to all the other motions in the group.

[Translation]

Motions Nos. 4, 9, 13, 18, 23, 27, 32, 37 and 41 will be grouped for debate but voted on in the following way:

(a) the vote on Motion No. 4 will apply to Motions Nos. 18 and 32;

(b) the vote on Motion No. 9 will apply to Motions Nos. 23 and 37;

(c) the vote on Motion No. 13 will apply to Motions Nos. 27 and 41.

[English]

Motions Nos. 14, 28 and 42 will be grouped for debate. A vote on Motion No. 14 applies to Motions 28 and 42.

[Translation]

I will now submit the motions in the first group to the House.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I move that all the motions be taken as having been read. That will leave more time for the debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-77, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 14 and 15, on page 1, with the following:

““Commission” means a Mediation Commission established under this”.

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-77, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing lines 35 and 36, on page 3, with the following:

“8. (1) During the mediation period,”.

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-77, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 22, on page 4, with the following:

“a Mediation Commission shall be”.

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-77, in Clause 11, be amended by replacing lines 46 to 48, on page 6, with the following:

“11.(1) Within fifty days after its establishment, each Commission shall”.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-77, in Clause 11, be amended by replacing lines 5 to 14, on page 7, with the following:

Government Orders

“was established, endeavour to mediate all the matters referred to it and to bring about an agreement between the employer and the union on those matters;”.

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-77, in Clause 11, be amended by replacing lines 20 and 21, on page 7, with the following:

“(c) submit a report to the Minister who shall lay the report before the House of Commons within ten days

(i) unless the parties have reached an agreement within that period; or

(ii) where no agreement is reached, the parties may, by mutual agreement, submit their dispute to arbitration or shall recover their rights under Part I of the Canada Labour Code, once the ten days have expired.”

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-77, in Clause 11, be amended by deleting lines 22 to 30, on page 7.

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-77, in Clause 13, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 46, on page 7 and lines 1 to 6, on page 8, with the following:

“for the purposes of the mediation referred to in subparagraph 11(1)(a)(i), all the powers of a conciliation commissioner under section 84 of the Canada Labour Code.”

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 14.

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 15.

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-77, in Clause 25, be amended by replacing lines 9 and 10, on page 11, with the following:

““Commission” means a Mediation Commission established under this”.

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-77, in Clause 30, be amended by replacing lines 1 and 2, on page 13, with the following:

“30. During the mediation period.”.

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-77, in Clause 31, be amended by replacing line 14, on page 13, with the following:

“a Mediation Commission shall be”.

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-77, in Clause 33, be amended by replacing lines 38 to 40, on page 15, with the following:

“33.(1) Within fifty days after its establishment, each Commission shall”.

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-77, in Clause 33, be amended by replacing lines 45 to 47, on page 15, and lines 1 to 7, page 16, with the following:

“was established, endeavour to mediate all the matters referred to it and to bring about an agreement between the employer and the union on those matters;”.

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-77, in Clause 33, be amended by replacing lines 13 and 14, on page 16, with the following:

“(c) submit a report to the Minister who shall lay the report before the House of Commons within ten days

(i) unless the parties have reached an agreement within that period; or

(ii) where no agreement is reached, the parties may, by mutual agreement, submit their dispute to arbitration or shall recover their rights under Part I of the Canada Labour Code, once the ten days have expired.”

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-77, in Clause 33, be amended by deleting lines 15 to 23, on page 16.

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-77, in Clause 35, be amended by replacing lines 33 to 41, on page 16, with the following:

“for the purposes of the mediation referred to in subparagraph 33(1)(a)(i), all the powers of a conciliation commissioner under section 84 of the *Canada Labour Code*.”

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 36.

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 37.

Motion No. 29

That Bill C-77, in Clause 47, be amended by replacing lines 3 and 4, on page 20, with the following:

““Commission” means a Mediation Commission established under this”.

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-77, in Clause 52, be amended by replacing lines 30 and 31, on page 21, with the following:

“52. During the mediation period.”.

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-77, in Clause 53, be amended by replacing line 2, on page 22, with the following:

“a Mediation Commission shall be”.

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-77, in Clause 55, be amended by replacing lines 24 to 26, on page 24, with the following:

“55.(1) Within fifty days after its establishment, each Commission shall”.

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-77, in Clause 55, be amended by replacing lines 31 to 40, on page 24, with the following:

“was established, endeavour to mediate all the matters referred to it and to bring about an agreement between the employer and the union on those matters;”.

Motion No. 35

That Bill C-77, in Clause 55, be amended by replacing lines 46 and 47, on page 24, with the following:

Government Orders

“(c) submit a report to the Minister who shall lay the report before the House of Commons within ten days

(i) unless the parties have reached an agreement within that period; or

(ii) where no agreement is reached, the parties may, by mutual agreement, submit their dispute to arbitration or shall recover their rights under Part I of the Canada Labour Code once the ten days have expired.”

Motion No. 36

That Bill C-77, in Clause 55, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 9, on page 25.

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-77, in Clause 57, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 27, on page 25, with the following:

“for the purposes of the mediation referred to in subparagraph 55(1)(a)(i), all the powers of a conciliation commissioner under section 84 of the Canada Labour Code.”

Motion No. 39

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 58.

Motion No. 40

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 59.

(0950)

She said: Madam Speaker, it is because the official opposition takes its role seriously that, right on Monday, proposals were made to the government, proposals that would have served a dual purpose: to bring about a speedy resumption of work and also a meaningful settlement, a negotiated settlement to this serious situation that impacts on the Canadian economy.

I should point out that, instead of accepting our offer, the government decided—I call it as I see it—to capitalize on the circumstances, the difficulties created by this strike, as any strike. Strikes are never fun, neither for the strikers—who feel this is something they are forced to do—nor for those who suffer the consequences.

The government took advantage of this situation to sort out its problem, and that is to have working conditions imposed on rail workers.

It is important to remind the House that a two-stage mediation-arbitration process was recommended to the government in the Hope report, and this recommendation was made for the very simple reason that the companies have already tried to obtain concessions in the past.

What is unusual is this statement: their demands are so controversial and provocative because of the partisan role taken by the government—the word is mine—who supports the position of the railway companies and because of the tenacity with which the companies have stuck to these demands.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Order. I would ask hon. members who want to have private conversations to please step out.

Mrs. Lalonde: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This is a momentous event in the history of the Parliament of Canada. Without taking too much of my speaking time, I would just like to say that we realize this is emergency legislative action and it is being taken for the second time in a short time.

All week long, we have been guided both by the proposals tabled this morning and the need to bring about a meaningful settlement. The government sabotaged the Hope report's recommendations. Commissioner Hope recommended steps be taken to bring both sides together to allow them to negotiate settlements, these being the only way out of this difficult situation in which the companies claim to be.

Let me read you a paragraph of the Hope report which gives hope—no pun intended—and we want to give this hope a chance.

(0955)

We can read this on page 72: “During the commission's proceedings, it was rather obvious that it would be possible to negotiate settlements if freight carriers were prepared to accept the fact that they will probably not win on all fronts, and that they will have to pay for the changes which they want, regardless of the settlement process. Similarly, if the unions recognized the fact that both companies are confronted with a financial reality which requires that some arrangements be made in the interest of all the parties, they might be more willing to negotiate an acceptable compromise”.

We can see the possibility for a settlement. This is what Commissioner Hope looked for. He provided the government with tools to reach a negotiated settlement. But instead, the government chose to impose one, without giving the parties time to meet face to face and express their respective views on the problems and the future of the railway industry.

We wanted to give the parties a real chance, and this is why the series of amendments brought forward this morning propose mediation commissions which would report to the minister who, in turn, would have ten days to table a report to Parliament which would become a public document. If agreements were reached within that ten-day period, the report would not go public. Otherwise, at the end of this process, the parties would either mutually agree to go to arbitration or, if they have not reached a settlement—but we think they would—the Labour Code provisions dealing with their rights would apply once again.

Another way of doing things must be found when you do not rely on a power struggle. In Quebec, we spent a lot of time looking at these issues and workers now have the right to strike, even in the health sector, provided essential services are maintained.

Government Orders

In Canada, the Labour Code provides the right to strike, but that right is completely taken away by the government, when it should come into play.

As I said repeatedly:

[*English*]

If the Canadian economy and politics cannot afford the Canada Labour Code, there is a big problem because it means that the problems will never be settled.

[*Translation*]

And when problems are not really solved, they resurface and then they are much worse. This is what Commissioner Hope explains in his report.

We want to make it clear to those who are listening, and who may have suffered some inconvenience, that these workers are exercising a right which is provided in the Labour Code. They want a negotiated settlement, not an imposed one; they stated that they are prepared to accept a compromise.

Commissioner Hope clearly showed that the companies' hard-nosed attitude was due to the fact that they have the government's support. Today, this House has an opportunity to concretely show that the country is headed for new labour relations, and not only where unions exist. The government must be a role model. It must define the kind of labour relations which will prevail in this country. However, the government is not fulfilling its role when it is not paving the way to a future which includes not only companies, but also every individual.

(1000)

It is because we highly respect our role as the official opposition that we want to stress here in this House how essential it is for Canadians and Quebecers to realize, through this conflict, that a new direction is necessary, so that new economic conditions can indeed be taken into consideration but, more importantly, that we do not sacrifice, as is now so often the case, the right of every individual to be treated with respect.

I invite the government to support the spirit of our amendments. Rather than taking us back to the days when labour conditions were dictated only by the prevailing economic forces, these proposals seek to lead us to a climate of respect between the employers and the workers.

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the purpose of the amendments presented this morning by members of the Bloc Québécois and, more specifically, by the hon. member for Mercier, is to remove the entire concept of arbitration from the bill and to limit the bill to a mediation process.

The approach taken by the Bloc Québécois may be a sign that they did not follow the progress of negotiations after the collective agreement expired. As you know, the parties tend to

start negotiating before a collective agreement expires. The agreement expired on December 31, 1993, so that the parties started negotiating several months before that date. Subsequently, we appointed a conciliator to help the two parties negotiate.

When this did not produce tangible results, we appointed a conciliation commissioner who again for several months, tried to get the parties to negotiate and conclude an agreement. It has always been and always will be the position of this government to help the parties negotiate and reach an agreement. Actually, most collective agreements in federally regulated sectors are concluded without intervention by the government as such and without the need for legislation.

The proposal made by the Bloc Québécois this morning would mean that negotiations would be continued for 60 days. First 50 days, then a report to the House, and if the mediation process fails, employees and companies will again be in a position to strike or impose a lockout. That means that exactly 60 days from now, we could be facing the same situation. Today is March 25, and we might be back in this House on May 25, with a nation-wide work stoppage in the railway sector.

I do not think the proposal is realistic. There would have to be evidence that there is a good chance of succeeding through mediation alone, and that is not the case. Both parties have reached an impasse at this point. Neither party has asked for mediation.

(1005)

The parties want to go back to work, that is quite clear. They want the system to work, but both parties have reached an impasse.

I heard a representative for the unions who appeared before the Senate this week, and it was interesting to hear his response when the senators asked if the people who act as mediators do arbitration as well, and whether we should not separate mediation and arbitration. Do you know what he told the senators? He said: "You know, when we have a mediator, and we know that if we do not agree, it will be up to the same person to make the decision for us, well, when the mediator looks us in the eye and begs us to reach an agreement, we know perfectly well what that means, and it makes us negotiate a little harder so he will not have to make the decision himself". This was said in the Senate by a representative from one of the biggest unions in the railway sector.

It is quite clear that each situation must be assessed on its merits. I appointed a mediator in the Port of Montreal, but the situation was entirely different. First of all, the Port of Montreal has a long tradition of successful collective bargaining. It has been more than 20 years since we had a general strike in the Port of Montreal. Second, the parties were amenable and really wanted to reach an agreement. These are prerequisites for mediation. Third, it should be clear that the economic repercussions of the strike in the Port of Montreal, compared with the

Government Orders

economic repercussions of the strike throughout Canada's railway system from coast to coast are not the same.

Not long ago, the House passed back-to-work legislation which imposed a mediation-arbitration process on the ports on the west coast of Canada. Oddly enough, Bloc members did not react the way they are doing now. Does this mean that the members of the Bloc are not the official opposition and are not concerned about what happens on the west coast of this country? Why is it that today, they are criticizing the principle of mediation-arbitration, while last time, although mediation-arbitration was involved as well, there was no discussion of the principles at stake as there is today. What is going on? Do we really have an official opposition that is concerned about Canada's economy from coast to coast? I wonder. I am really amazed at this change in the position of the Bloc Quebecois.

Since last Sunday we have tried to obtain the consent of the Bloc Quebecois for the passage of the bill before the House. If these amendments are the only thing they can come up with after five days, I am sorry to say that we cannot accept them, because we need results, and above all, we do not want to be faced with exactly the same situation in two months' time.

(1010)

[English]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Madam Speaker, we just heard the Minister of Labour questioning whether the Bloc was the official opposition. It is the official opposition and the Reform Party is the national opposition.

The Bloc mentioned the noble conception of its role. I disagree with that. I do not find anything about what it is doing with regard to the legislation noble. I find the actions of the Bloc Quebecois selfish and the most unconscionable I have seen in Parliament. It has held up this legislation. It refused to waive the 48 hour notice necessary to get this in and debated quickly. It has used every procedural tactic at its disposal to further delay the passage of this bill.

We have to question what it is trying to accomplish. We know the legislation is going to pass. The Bloc knows the legislation is going to pass. It knows the CP, CN and VIA workers are going to be legislated back to work. The Bloc is costing them extra pay, costing the company extra revenue and costing companies all across Canada a great deal of income.

Why is it doing this? Why is it selfish? The reason is the port of Montreal. That is the sole reason we are all here today on the weekend debating these delaying tactics offered up by the Bloc.

When the port of Montreal went down it happened that the Standing Committee on Transport was in Halifax. Halifax was booming. Everyone was walking around with a great smile on their face because they had a tremendous amount of business coming their way. It was pointed out to the member of the Bloc who sat on that committee: "You had better go back and tell those people in the port they are really making a big mistake because some of the traffic diverting to Halifax is not going to go back when the strike is over. That is the way things operate".

The Bloc took that to heart because we did not see too much of it for a while after that. There were lots of telephone calls back and forth. Then this great saving situation happened, the rail strike. All of a sudden Halifax cannot get a lot of the goods to load on the ships being diverted there. This played right into its hands.

I wonder why there is so much emphasis on the port of Montreal. This is not an action on behalf of Quebec, which the Bloc is really supposed to represent because it is certainly not representing the rest of Canada. This is costing manufacturers, importers, people all across the country huge sums of money. The total loss is expected to run in the range of \$3 billion to \$5 billion and that does not end when the strike is over.

This is not costing B.C. companies or Saskatchewan companies. It is companies all across Canada, including companies in Quebec. Bloc members are hurting the economy of their own province. They are hurting it at a time when they know full well the legislation is going to be passed in any case. This is nothing more than a simple tactic.

As was mentioned by the Minister of Labour during her speech this morning, there was not a peep out of Bloc members when the same legislation was brought in on dock workers in Vancouver. Why? Because they did not care. It was the very same principle but it did not matter to them then. It was not the port of Montreal.

The Bloc is trying to take every tactic to ensure that the rail stays out until after the port of Montreal goes back to work. That is all they are interested in.

The Liberals are not totally innocent in this either. We brought this up long before the strike ever came in. We brought it up last year when legislation was brought in for the dock workers in Vancouver. Our economy is far too fragile and far too interwoven to allow something this massive to go on. We have to find alternatives and no action has been taken by the government to do so.

(1015)

During the first week of the strike I attempted to contact the Minister of Labour numerous times. I was promised a return call. My intention was to find ways to work with the government to bring the matter back so that we could get it settled. We were

Government Orders

quite prepared to co-operate. I know the minister was extremely busy at that time, as well being relatively new in the portfolio. I understood that.

Appointments were made for the return of my phone call and they were never kept. The Liberals had the opportunity to use broader legislation at the time they legislated back the Vancouver dock workers. It only took them two days to do that. Why has it taken them so long in the case of the rail strike? The reason probably is that they had to wait to make sure that CN was fully involved in the strike so that they could bring CN into the scope of the legislation as well.

The government's real target is CN. It wants to bring in legislation that includes binding arbitration for CN. That is the only part of all the tactics of the Bloc I have some agreement with.

One problem in the legislation is the arbitration clause. It says with regard to CN that there will be one member from the union; one member from the company, which is the government; and one member appointed by the government. We have a vague idea about how the arbitration will come out.

The only alternative in this case is the Liberal solution used in the case of the dock workers' strike last year. Why did they use it last year and not now? I am talking of final offer selection arbitration which gives the company and the union the chance to get much closer together. It puts a lot more pressure on them to be as close as possible and to take the most reasonable position possible. It will allow them to settle outstanding issues and try to reach a total agreement. In the end it will be one side or the other. Whoever is the more unreasonable of the two will be the loser.

That is a fairer operation than the type of arbitration that has been brought forward. We have to go with the legislation because we have to get the country back to work. That is the bottom line. That is the most important part of the whole legislation.

I ask the Bloc to start acting like a national opposition party, be responsible, put the country back to work and put the economy back on its feet.

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the debate today is against a background of Canada's burgeoning export records, the extraordinary successes that Canada has achieved in its export trade which are being jeopardized by the present strike of the railway.

The amendments before the House this morning would attempt to resolve that strike through mediation. Mediation, however, would require yet another 60 days of deliberation and

would not bring any early conclusion to the severe disruptions in our export trade resulting from the prolonged strike.

If we have arbitration we can have an early resolution of the problem that faces us. It is for that reason that we on this side of the House oppose the amendments and intend to support the rapid implementation of the bill now before the House.

The rail strike today is causing all sorts of disruptions in our export trade which, as I said a moment ago, has reached record levels in 1994 and again in the first month of 1995.

(1020)

Canada recorded an annual trade surplus with the world of over \$17 billion in 1994, up almost \$8 billion over the previous year. Our trade surplus with the United States was \$28.4 billion or \$8.7 billion higher than in 1993. In addition to those formidable achievements, Canada has recorded a record merchandise trade surplus with Japan of over \$1.3 billion.

In the case of Japan and Europe, as well as in the case of the United States, the success of our trade achievement depends on the ability of our railways to deliver our products directly or to ports for shipment.

As a result of the strike we found that severe disruptions were already occurring. In the automotive sector, the Ford Motor Company has had to curtail its production, reduce its assembly line operations. In the pulp and paper industry in the province of Quebec, the large company Repap Enterprises will shortly have to close its operations altogether since it cannot have access to its natural resources nor have the opportunity to ship its products to markets where there is demand for Canadian exports.

I draw the attention of the House to the fact that in the January Canada recorded a trade surplus of some \$2.4 billion in that one month, up by \$285 million from December 1994. In January 1995 Canadian exports stood at a record level of \$22.5 billion, up by \$1.3 billion over December 1994.

In those circumstances we have a situation where Canadian exports to the United States and American exports to Canada total \$1 billion a day, every day, day in and day out all year round. It is imperative that rail services be available to ensure that our goods reach the markets that have expressed such demand for Canadian products.

We have already seen a situation arise where as a result of the rail strike rail cars have been retained in Canada when they should be moving goods and services across the border to the United States. As I noted a moment ago, the products for overseas are being detained because of an inability to reach our ports. All this is against a background of increasing liberalized trade, of freer market access that provides Canadians with the opportunity to ship their products across the globe.

Government Orders

Through the evolution of the North American Free Trade Agreement and our commitment to free trade in the western hemisphere we have seen new opportunities for Canadian products in our own hemisphere.

The growth of the markets in Asia is known to all of us. We have seen the so-called Asian tigers come forward as promising new markets for Canadian goods and services. We have a highly profitable market available to us in Japan, markets that will only be enhanced by the commitment that all member countries of the Asia Pacific Economic Co-Operation have made to trade liberalization, indeed free trade, within 25 years throughout Asia and the Pacific.

In the case of Europe the growth of the European Union, its deepening and its expansion to additional countries have led to greater opportunities for Canadian exports.

(1025)

In a world of increasingly liberalized trade, especially with the new World Trade Organization that came into being on January 1, there are ample opportunities, promising new opportunities, for Canadians. We have achieved such remarkable success in ensuring the sale of Canadian goods and services abroad that we cannot allow the situation in our basic rail system to continue.

There must be a resolution to this obstacle to our further growth in international trade, to the achievement of yet greater levels in 1995, and to the achievement of a permanent and more satisfactory method of resolving disputes and differences within our rail system.

An hon. member: Team Canada.

Mr. MacLaren: It is evident to everyone, as one of my colleagues reminds me, that Team Canada must have as an underpinning the assurance of an efficient and reliable transport system. Team Canada is the combined efforts of the provinces and of the federal government to ensure that there is a concerted effort, that all the energies of Canadians provincial and federal are directed toward the achievement of our export goals. Nowhere is this more evident than in our combined efforts to ensure that small and medium size businesses are fully involved in the export successes that have marked the Canadian economy over past years.

Our efforts to promote small and medium size enterprises in the export world, including our vigorous efforts to ensure that small businesses in Quebec also enjoy those opportunities, can only be hindered by the absence of a reliable and efficient rail system. It is for that reason we oppose the amendments that have been brought forward this morning and look for an early resolution of the rail strike that is causing such disruption to our export trade.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Madam Speaker, I think it is highly significant that the second speaker for the government, the Minister for International Trade, spoke for ten minutes without mentioning labour relations for one single second. He said nothing at all about the situation of the workers affected by this bill. I think this is a clear indication of the government's true objectives.

The bill before us and the series of amendments are the clearest indication of the government's real objectives. The aim of the bill is not a return to work. If it were, the dispute would have been resolved four days ago. We offered the possibility Monday, we offered it Wednesday. Everyone agrees on a return to work. The disagreement lies in the fact that special legislation imposes a new type of relations on the parties concerned in the rail sector.

Let us have a look at the amendments. First, commissions were set up with the power to arbitrate and a biased mandate. The proof is in clause 12. I think it is important for all Canadians and Quebecers to understand this. The government's bill provides that:

12. Each Commission shall be guided by the need for terms and conditions of employment that are consistent with—economic viability and competitiveness—taking into account the importance of good labour-management relations.

This is the first time I have seen a government put improvement of the economy ahead of agreement between the parties, in a bill. With this clause, the government decided to do a job on the entire rail sector. As the negotiators failed to reach an agreement, the government wants to ensure the transformation of the rail sector with clause 12 and force the commissions to do the job.

(1030)

When the members of the commission see an interesting proposal from the union, their hands will be bound by this clause, which says to them: what the union is proposing will not lead to the economic viability and competitiveness of the rail system, which is the first requirement of the legislation, therefore you will not be able to accept the proposal. We are proposing a much more reasonable clause in keeping with the longstanding spirit of labour relations in Quebec and Canada. The aim of this proposal is not only to protect the workers, but also to make the future interesting in this sector and prevent people from getting into labour relations problems in the coming years.

I think this proposal comes from our added experience in Quebec of working together, of taking an approach to labour relations that permits each side to come out a winner. This is the essence of labour relations. It is nothing like arbitration, which creates a winner and a loser, because in the years following arbitration, the loser prepares to win the next time, with grievances and all sorts of unacceptable situations arising as the

Government Orders

result. It seems to me that the government should understand this.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crête: We are proposing in this regard that the commission be guided first by the need to establish good union-management relations and, to this end, that it promote working conditions reflecting both the rights of the workers and the economic viability and competitiveness of the coast-to-coast rail system. And the way it is written means that we think that human resources is what is most important. It is what we hear in speeches around the world right now about globalization. What will make us competitive is the way we treat our human resources, not putting workers in no-win situations. Both workers and management must come out winners. Was management in favour of getting everybody back to work at the beginning of the week? Do you think they would agree with that? Go ask the management of the companies.

I think that this vision of government is dangerous and that it is important for all of the citizens of Quebec and Canada to go beyond this way of looking at things and to see the government's relationship with society evolve. The government is going to systematically decide who is right in society. The government is going to decide who is right and wrong, and the next in line for the snow job that railway workers are getting now will be the unemployed. The next victims after that will be another social category, and it will always be done under the pretext that we absolutely need to do such and such a thing for affordability, to emulate the American way, and that is why the official opposition is against this way of thinking. I think that we have nothing to learn from a party that has five members present in the House when we are dealing with special legislation.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I would ask the hon. member not to remark on the presence or absence of other hon. members.

Mr. Crête: Thank you, Madam Speaker. At any rate, Canadians can see what happens during votes and see who is there to vote and who is not.

Therefore, I think that this series of amendments contains an interesting proposal, and it is important for Canadians to understand that we are not opposing this bill to prevent people from returning to work, we are doing it to ensure that, in the future, two, three, five, ten years down the road, that there are good labour relations in this sector, that people have choices, that part of the network will be sold. That will have to be negotiated anyway with the unions, and because we have put them in a situation where they cannot trust their employers, they will continue to distrust them and we will have problems. When

Parliament has to bring in three special labour relations acts in one year, that is a sure sign that there is a volatile situation in Canada, and that it is one that would be better dealt with by some means other than a government gag order.

I think it is important for Canadians to hear how the government is going against the recommendations of the Hope report.

(1035)

According to the Hope report, there are a number of major points on which the parties could agree and we could then proceed to the more technical points and, if need be, resort to arbitration for some of these technical points. The government held its nose and decided to ignore that part.

What saddens me a little is that I feel they are taking advantage of the fact that a new minister has been appointed. She must be briefed on the issues while fulfilling an economic mandate, although the labour relations mandate is not necessarily to settle economic problems but to ensure a good labour relations climate. This is a basic element on which we should agree.

I sincerely believe that the amendment proposing that the commission be guided by the need to establish good labour relations as a top priority is the first step in a successful approach that would allow the whole railway industry to see its future in a different light.

Let us assume that, in two years, CN wants to sell, for example, part of its line to people in eastern Quebec, the Eastern Townships or the Maritimes. With a binding decision like that one, the unions will never feel formally bound by the outcome of the negotiations, which will show at every phase of the talks with the new employers. The employer faced with these new situations will keep in mind that he could win through a decision such as this special act of Parliament.

The employers in these situations may not want union accreditations to be adjusted to the new employers. Are there ways for these employers to ensure preferential treatment from the government? Ensuring economic viability by taking away workers' rights? This is the wrong way to see the debate, as I see it.

In conclusion, you can be sure that, in labour relations, if we do not see to it that there are two winners, the unions and the employers, one of the parties will always have its moment of truth in catching up later.

Shortsighted decisions such as this bill can only be corrected by achieving a balance between the parties. Parliament's responsibility is not to impose a different way to look at railway development through special labour legislation. If we want to change the railway industry, we should do so openly through bills to that effect, but not on the backs of Canadian workers because, at the end of the day, it is not only railway workers who

Government Orders

will pay, but all those whose livelihoods depend on this industry and all train users across Canada.

I hope that the government will finally decide to listen to our arguments.

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, first of all, I welcome this opportunity to mention that our new Minister of Labour has done an outstanding job regarding this strike.

[*English*]

It is not often that a new minister finds herself or himself with such a heavy agenda so soon after being made a member of the government. The fact that our Minister of Labour has acted so quickly and effectively in dealing with this strike is a great tribute to her.

[*Translation*]

I have a problem with the Bloquistes opposing this bill. I find it quite strange that, last week, when we legislated the resumption of work on the west coast, they did not seem to be very interested.

I also noticed that the hon. member for Longueuil dissociated himself from his party. He said his phone had been ringing off the hook with nothing but calls of support and that he even received calls from staunch sovereignists and mayors who wanted to congratulate him. Clearly, this is clearly how the people of Quebec feel because the economic impact the strike is having on Canada and Quebec is extremely serious.

(1040)

I wonder why the members of this political party, who claim that definitely the only thing they were prepared to agree to as a party was sovereignty for Quebec, all of them but one agree with this strike action. Clearly, they are now sending to the people of Quebec the signal that a sovereign Quebec would be run by the unions. They do not care what the ordinary people of Quebec think.

[*English*]

The effects in Quebec and the effects across Canada of this strike have to be dealt with. There is an old African saying that when the elephants fight the grass gets hurt.

It is just fine for these people to come in and talk about the sanctity of labour relations. We think that is important too. In fact nothing would have been more desirable for the government than to see the parties to this dispute find their own resolution of it. That is why we waited; it was in order to see that the best possible efforts could be made.

In the face of a national rail strike, the Bloquistes know that governments in the past have always been obliged to act. The effect on the economy is such that we simply must act in the interests of all Canadians whose jobs and livelihoods depend directly and indirectly on the rails. Listen to the impact.

One of the main industries being affected is the aluminium industry.

[*Translation*]

The aluminum industry is the most important industry for the economy of Quebec, particularly for its rural areas, and it depends on rail transport.

[*English*]

Thirty thousand people are employed in that sector. It produces \$8 billion annually in shipments. Two-thirds of all outbound shipments of aluminium are shipped by rail. Over three-quarters of the industry's inbound shipments, such as the chemicals that are used in the industry, are transported by rail, 90 per cent of the shipment by rail and \$4.5 billion annually comprising exports to the United States. Alcan and Reynolds are now operating at only 70 per cent of capacity. Their plants are in the province of Quebec.

In the automotive sector, earlier this week Ford had to lay off 3,500 workers at Oakville; 2,500 at St. Thomas; and 400 at Windsor due to the strike. Most of them are back now but operating at half capacity. All the auto manufacturers are experiencing difficulty moving finished vehicles. Trucks are used to bring in most inbound shipments, 85 per cent, although rail is used for some essential bulk inputs such as body metal and plastics. This industry itself accounts for over \$50 billion annually in output and employs about 150,000 people.

The chemicals industry, especially commodity chemicals, is a major user of the rail system. Seventy per cent of outbound shipments, about \$15 billion annually, is sent by rail from Alberta to Ontario and British Columbia, from plants in Ontario and Quebec to the United States, to maritime ports for shipment overseas. Chemical shipments amount to about \$20 billion annually. The industry employs 80,000 Canadians.

The fertilizer industry, potash and chemical fertilizers, is a major rail user. Two-thirds of the fertilizer shipments, about \$1.25 billion annually, travel by rail. The industry is located mainly in Alberta and Saskatchewan with 6,000 people employed and shipments worth \$2 billion annually.

[*Translation*]

The pulp and paper industry, another very important industry for Quebec, also depends on rail transport.

[*English*]

Along with aluminium it is probably the most vulnerable to disruption of rail service. It employs 100,000 Canadians in all parts of the country. Shipments are worth over \$20 billion a year.

(1045)

The effect of a prolonged rail strike on this industry is crucial. There is one very simple thing we have to understand. I have other statistics. I could keep reading them but it is important to

Government Orders

conclude on this thought. We have built a very prosperous country. Our prosperity has come to a very great extent from the ability we have to extract natural resources, whether from the forests, whether agricultural, whether from the mines or in the past from the sea, and selling them to the world as price makers.

That is no longer so easy for us. Competition on resource prices is extreme. The difficulty we have in getting our goods to market contributes directly to our competitiveness not just in the manufacturing sector but in the natural resource sector.

In the past it was easy for us to collect the rents from our natural resources. The world was willing to pay the prices we wanted and pay for the transportation costs built in. We built a railway in times when transportation costs were not a big factor in the price we could charge for the goods we sold. That world has changed. We are in a world of extreme competitiveness.

The Bloc should understand how important it is to our overall economy that we be competitive not just in the manufacturing sector but also in the transportation sector, and in a real way.

That is the issue we are going to have to deal with over the weeks and months to come in the resolution of this labour disruption. The competitiveness of our transportation system is a crucial element in the competitiveness of both our natural resource and our manufacturing sectors in the world at large.

In container traffic to eastern Canada bound from the Pacific we are only attracting 40 per cent of that traffic on the Canadian rail system. Sixty per cent is using the U.S. rail system. That is a competitiveness factor. We have to understand that other countries get their natural resources to ocean bound vessels with less distance involved than we face. The competitiveness of our transportation sector is crucial.

Time has come for Canadians to deal with the issue of competitiveness in our transportation industry. It has been dealt with in our manufacturing sector. People in Quebec, in Ontario and elsewhere have faced the necessity of difficult downsizing, of coming to terms with needing to rationalize manufacturing facilities, plants, acquiring new equipment, all for the purpose of being able to ensure the continuing prosperity of their firms, their regions, their provinces and this country. Now is the time for the transportation sector as well to deal in a real and continuing and lasting way with this serious issue.

Mr. Jake E. Hooppner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to speak to the bill today.

I have heard a few comments about the ability of members to count. I know they can go to five. I am wondering if they have ever read the story in the Old Testament about David and Goliath and what happened to the giant. I am very proud today to stand here and see the confidence our leader has that the five members here will handle the giants on both sides or all around us.

I have heard a lot of insults thrown around this morning. It is a little discouraging to hear some of them. This problem has been around for 25 years. It was not created in the last situation between labour and management.

Fifteen times governments have legislated people back to work and said they have solved the problem. We have never solved any problems and the simple reason is governments have been buying people to get elected.

I am pro labour. I am pro management. If I can get small business or large business, I will get a vote. I will go to the House and run the country. This is why we are here again today trying to resolve an issue.

(1050)

I will tell the House a story about labour management relations and I hope members will listen. During the break I was asked to visit a plant in my riding which is a branch of a multinational corporation. I knew most of its products were shipped into the U.S. I felt that this was probably another situation where I would get the news that it was either going to downsize or close.

The news was it was going to expand by over \$17 million. I said what is going on here, everybody is shutting down and this one is expanding. The plant manager said: "I started in this plant as a floor sweeper. I left home at 16 and had to fend for myself. I came back to get into the community. Now I am plant manager". I asked: "What did it do to you? How did you show that kind of confidence to your superiors to get this job?"

He said: "When I took over this plant we were operating in the red and it looked as if it were going to be shut down. I went over the books and said I am unionized, I am going to lose my job here if things do not turn around. I called in the people and told them we were going to have a different type of management. I am going to be supervisor and you are going to run this plant. I am setting up four committees, one is going to do the hiring and firing; one is going to look after efficiency; one is going to work on problems, labour relations".

He said: "After a year you would not believe the increase in productivity in this plant. I have not hired a man. I have not fired a man. It is all done by the union. But I make sure when there is profit that my people get a fair wage increase. I know we are competing with the Americans and the head offices have given me the go ahead to increase production because this plant can survive".

That is labour management. That is how the country should be run, instead of the way it is right now. We had an opportunity a week ago to do something that would have set us in that direction. The House defeated Bill C-262, the motion of my hon. colleague. I do not think I will ever have an experience again such as I had this week when I sat with the forum of young

Government Orders

Canadians at its dinner. Since we were busy working on this legislation and I was on House duty, I could not be there for first part of the dinner. I came back to the House for about 45 minutes and had to leave again. Our whip had not been able to stay there either.

We discussed this situation with the students. One asked me whether I get a little discouraged when I see all the problems and work from maybe 8.00 a.m. until 10.00 or 11.00 p.m. and accomplish very little.

I said not really. At times I feel like going home but I think the 35th Parliament will go down in history as the turning point in our country, that finally it will make some decisions that will benefit the country, not destroy it.

An hon. member: The red book.

Mr. Hoepfner: The red book. The right start but we need the green book to cover the red book.

I pointed out to these young people what our problems were when we discussed job description and what was taking place on the Hill. I said I was actually proud to be part of the 35th Parliament. One young student said her generation will also set a precedent and be recorded in history. She said for the first time in history her generation is going to be asked to take a reduced standard of living, a lower standard of living.

She is probably right with all the cuts coming, with all the social program cuts. I asked her how she felt about it. She said it hurts but they know it is reality and are willing to make that sacrifice if it will do something for their country.

(1055)

I felt like saying send all the MPs home and let the kids run the country. They will make the decisions that have to be made. They are not interested in a multimillion dollar pension plan. They are interested in saving the country, bringing it back to what it was years ago.

We sit here throwing insults back and forth and we think we are doing our job. We are playing politics and politics is what has brought the country to where it is. I hope we realize that today, whether it is the Bloc, the Liberals or the Reform. The next generation is not going to be putting up with the politics we have seen in the 35th Parliament. The bright spot in our future is that we have kids willing to make sacrifices.

When I think of the first and second world wars, I see how many young people laid down their lives to protect this country and make it great. They left everything. They had no chance. What have we done in the last 25 years? We have put the country into debt by \$550 billion. We have an unemployment rate of around 10 per cent.

What has politics done for the country? We have left our kids a legacy they will have to deal with. I hope and pray they have the guts to do it because my grandchildren and future great-grandchildren will not have the opportunities I have had.

I hope it is serious enough in the House today that instead of throwing insults at each other, we buckle down, go to work and finally form some type of legislation that will put the country back on the road to recovery and make it the great country it can be.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to be able to say that I am proud to take part in this debate, but, unfortunately, such is not the case.

It is always preferable in this sort of dispute for the employer and the union to attempt to resolve their differences on their own. But, as we speak, after months and months of talks, the dispute drags on. Despite this government's efforts to resolve the conflict as quickly as possible, there is still one political party that prefers grandstanding to finding a solution to the crisis facing Canadians across this country.

Millions of workers are affected daily by this dispute. In the Montreal and Toronto areas alone, 70,000 workers who must get to their place of work every day are affected by this strike.

It affects not just large companies, but also small and medium size businesses, who depend on the railways for their survival.

As we speak, Canadian Pacific is paralyzed and Canadian National and VIA are for all practical purposes completely shut down. There are also automobile manufacturing plants in the Windsor area that have had to lay off 3,000 employees temporarily. The manufacturing sector is losing close to \$500 million daily. In other words, if the strike drags on, the loss to our economy, according to their estimates, will be somewhere between \$3 and \$5 billion dollars.

The Reform Party suggested that the Bloc Québécois was not worried about the dispute at the Port of Vancouver because it did not concern them. I would like to point out to them the economic effect of this dispute on Trois-Rivières, in Quebec.

(1100)

In Trois-Rivières, the Kruger paper company is losing a million dollars a day. Five hundred employees are affected. Also affected are Stone Consolidated in Port-Alfred, Pétromont in the Verchères region, the Shell refineries in the east end of Montreal, the entire Port of Vancouver, Alcan, ADI, Reynolds, and I could go on.

I ask myself if there are other brave souls like the member for Longueuil, who told his own party that what they are accusing us of doing is not true. The Bloc Québécois is accusing us of flexing our muscles. On the contrary, if anyone is being heavy

Government Orders

handed, it is the Leader of the Opposition, who always takes this approach when someone, including the member for Longueuil, does not agree with him. He told his own member that he would have to live with the political consequences of his action.

I would like to quote the member for Longueuil, who said: "I do not see why my constituents would take it out on me. In fact, the opposite seems to be happening. We have a major problem when the transportation system breaks down. People must return to work". This is why this dispute must be resolved as quickly as possible.

We have to ask why the Bloc Quebecois has taken this position. It claims to be the defender of workers in Quebec. This is not quite the case, because I myself have had calls from CN and CP railway workers in Coteau and Kirkland who are not happy that this dispute has still not been settled.

The economy, workers, everyone is affected, but still the Bloc Quebecois persists. It persists, in my opinion, for purely partisan reasons. They have said that we could have resolved this dispute as early as Monday. Again, this is not the case, because another 60 days would have gone by before the dispute was settled. Why does the Bloc see itself as the defender of workers? The main reason is because under Quebec law unions represent workers. It is no accident that the CNTU, the FTQ, in fact all the unions, support the separatist position. This is the sole reason for the Bloc's partisan politics today.

Thus far, at least the Reform Party is supporting us and even the NDP has seen the light. We have the support of the member for Longueuil and also of other members not brave enough to rise and vote against their party. Even the Quebec Minister of Transport has told us that this dispute must be resolved as quickly as possible.

But not the Bloc Quebecois. The Bloc wants to stall the process; it is not in its best interests to see things improve, because it does not want to show that federalism works. It really does not care about those affected by this conflict, including the small businesses that cannot get their raw materials or imports.

So, here we are today. We could have settled this conflict a long time ago. But no, we have to sit on a Saturday. I am told this is the fourth time, and it has not happened in years.

(1105)

An hon. member: That is what we are paid for.

Mr. Discepola: The hon. member said that is what we are paid for. Sure, but every hour spent in this House today costs the taxpayers an extra \$25,000. All this because, during an opposition day, the Bloc members insisted on talking about the CBC and the Department of National Defence, rather than try to solve this conflict.

I will conclude by referring to a comment made earlier this week by the Leader of the Opposition, who said that the referendum should be held as soon as possible.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Discepola: The sooner the referendum is held, the sooner the Bloc Quebecois will have to decide. Does it really want to play its role of official opposition and look after the interests of all Canadians, or rather pick and choose the issues, as it has already shown it is doing?

[*English*]

It is important to get this conflict settled as soon as possible, and not at the expense of the workers as the Bloc Quebecois would have us believe.

The government has always preferred to let conflicts be settled between the two parties involved. We have tried. The minister in her new role has tried in vain. We are at the point now where the economy is paralysed and companies are closing down. The government, contrary to what the Bloc Quebecois says, has decided to act.

Let us get the economy back on track. Let us get the trains running. Let us have the referendum as soon as possible. Then the Bloc will have to decide whether it wants to remain the opposition or resign and let the Reform take over.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Madam Speaker, following the failure of the Meech Lake Accord, the then Quebec Premier stated that, regardless of what was said or done, Quebec was and always would be a distinct society.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Guimond: Those are the only fine words spoken by former Premier Robert Bourassa. Today, we have yet another clear demonstration of that, and I want to tell the member for Vaudreuil and the federal Minister of Industry that, as far as democracy is concerned, Quebec has nothing to learn from these individuals. Let me explain.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Guimond: Madam Speaker, could you ask the hon. member for Nickel Belt, the young pup from Nickel Belt, to go yap outside the House?

Section 53 of the Quebec Labour Code provides for parties to begin and pursue their negotiations diligently and in good faith. Again this goes to show that the Quebec Labour Code is more progressive than the Canada Labour Code, which does not include any such provision. I want to point out to the House and to the people who are watching us that, contrary to what Liberal members may have said, the Bloc is not made up of unionists only. For 17 years, I was involved in labour relations on the

Government Orders

management side in Quebec, but there is one thing I have always respected and that is the workers' right to strike.

(1110)

I support management, I am proud of it, but I have always recognized the workers' right to strike and the employers' right to lock them out. Having made this clear, let us turn now to the Hope report. On the issue of good faith, I want to quote from page 58 of the Hope report, paragraph 1, where it says: "In brief, the unions are faced with proposals put forward by the railway companies which they cannot accept, so they must choose confrontation as their only alternative to these unacceptable demands". Unacceptable demands made by management.

Also on page 58 in the Hope report, paragraph a), it says: "The dispute resolves around the companies' demands which can be described as controversial and provocative."

Further down on page 58, the report reads: "Their demands—that is the companies' demands—are so controversial and provocative because of the partisan role taken by the government"—this is Commissioner Hope speaking—"the partisan role taken by the government"—which is, until further notice, the Liberal government—"which supports the position of the railway companies, and because of the tenacity with which the companies have stuck to these demands". This quote can be found on page 58 of the Hope report.

Mr. Loubier: This is only a huge charade on the part of the government, to score political points.

Mr. Guimond: I would ask the Canadians and Quebecers who are watching us today from their living room or their kitchen to remember—Quebec has a fine motto: "I remember"—that the Bloc Quebecois exposed the fact that the president of CN, Paul Tellier, who has a yearly salary of \$345,000 plus a \$52,000 a year expense account, received a \$300,000 interest-free loan to buy a house in Westmount.

Let us ask ourselves if it is normal, if it is realistic, in 1995, that a senior civil servant paid with our taxes, the taxes of Canadians and Quebecers, benefit from such perks. I do not care if these advantages are offered to the president of CP or the president of General Motors of Canada. If these companies want to share their profits, they have the right to do so. However, when the president of CN benefits from such perks and we are paying for that through our taxes, it is a different matter. Do the viewers who are watching us today pay their mortgage each month?

Mr. Loubier: Yes.

Mr. Guimond: We pay our mortgage, and the president of CN, who is a government official, should pay his mortgage like everybody else.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

An hon. member: He has negotiated good working conditions for himself.

Mr. Guimond: I welcome Paul Tellier to the next referendum debate and I look forward to hearing him say to Quebecers that they have to tighten their belts, just as he is saying to railway employees. There are full-page ads in the daily newspapers saying that CN has many employees who are paid for doing nothing. But what about his interest-free loan? We have to remind Canadians of that.

I also want to remind members of this House and all our viewers of what our Minister of Transport said at the beginning of October when he was guest speaker at a dinner held in Winnipeg by WESTAC, the Western Transportation Advisory Committee. He said: "Railway workers with grade eight or nine education cannot be blamed for negotiating excessive labour contracts".

That shows the contempt that the Minister of Transport feels for the 62,000 railway employees in Canada. These comments come from someone on the management side. I come from the management side, and I say that some things are totally unacceptable. The employees' level of education has nothing to do with all this. Railway workers are important for rail transport in Canada, and the proof of that is that, since they have decided to exercise their democratic right to stop working, rail transport is shut down.

(1115)

Often, we hear: "You, the opposition, are good at denouncing. You are good at blocking things". Yes, but we also make proposals. True, we oppose the government and I would like to tell the Liberal majority members that when we are not here any more, once the sovereignty of Quebec has come about, you will have the Reform Party as the official opposition and everything will be very fine. You will have an extreme right party as the official opposition and you will just see that everything will be fine in Canada. As for us, we will be sovereign.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the hon. member for Nickel Belt for reminding me of the role of the NDP, the party which had been, since the time of Tommy Douglas, traditionally committed to fight for the interests of workers. I want to say to all the workers of Canada and Quebec that the only party that is fighting for the rights of workers, including the right to strike, is the Bloc Quebecois. The NDP has abandoned workers.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Loubier: They joined the Reform.

An hon. member: That is true. They abandoned them.

Mr. Loubier: The NDP Reformers.

Mr. Guimond: What is the Bloc Quebecois proposing? We are told that we are good at criticizing, but we also put proposals forward. As recently as last Tuesday, our leader, the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean, really made an offer to the Prime

Government Orders

Minister and the government, saying: “We agree to pass back to work legislation and to ensure mediation for 60 days, to put an end to the exercise of the right to strike and the right to order a lockout, so that the parties can negotiate on an equal basis, freely and democratically. Then after that, we will see”.

We proposed exactly the same solution as the one used in the dispute at the Port of Montreal. There are 7,000 containers now leaving the port of Montreal. People there are busy working and negotiating and my sources tell me that there is good hope an agreement will be reached. There has been no special legislation to deal with the dispute at the Port of Montreal.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Guimond: I just described the suggestion put forward by the Bloc. In conclusion, I would like to remind the House of what the Liberals are suggesting. They want to cut down on working conditions of railway workers, more particularly those at CN. The last budget announced a garage sale, a spring clearance sale in the transportation sector. To make the assets more saleable, collective agreements will be made less expensive, especially those of the workers at CN. The Liberals want to take away from workers their basic right to strike, the only democratic means they have to express their dissatisfaction with their employer. Nobody likes to go on strike, but when you have to, you have no choice.

Mr. Martin Cauchon (Outremont, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very proud to take the floor today to speak to Bill C-77, an Act to provide for the maintenance of railway operations and subsidiary services.

I am proud because the action the government and the Minister of Labour have taken is basically a responsible move. When I look at the opposition members, I have to admit, much to my regret, that they are consistent. Members of the official opposition party are consistent because they always had as their philosophy that politics never work. Consequently, they apply that philosophy to everything they do.

People are told that is their philosophy, and people will make up their own mind. But now, I would like to examine the two opposite positions we have before us today. On one side, we have the stance of the official opposition that wants to amend the bill.

(1120)

Where does that amendment leave us? The opposition proposes a 60-day mediation process, that is 50 days for mediation and 10 days to let the Minister read the report and table it in the House. But, after these 60 days, if there is no agreement, we are in a dead end, and it is back to square one with the lockout, strike and never-ending disputes. That is not the way things should work with responsible people and a responsible government.

On the other side, there is the position of the government, which is reasonable and responsible, which I support and which gives a mediation-arbitration commission composed of three persons a 70-day mandate to let the parties try to reach an agreement by mediation. During this 70-day period, the committee will hear both parties, and then, if the parties still do not reach an agreement, there is no denying that the members of the commission will have in hand all the necessary elements to make a proper decision. They will be able to weigh both sides and, after the 70 days, if no agreement is reached—because we, as the government, want to go ahead, and all parties, no doubt, want to go ahead—this commission will make a decision in full knowledge of the facts.

There is no need to go any further and explain in greater detail the positions of both parties. There is no need to further elaborate to see that the government's solution is realistic and reasonable. However, I will repeat what I said at the beginning. It is sad to see that members from the Official Opposition are unable to rise above their own political interest and partisanship. How can they confuse their own interest with that of the population, the public interest? How can they confuse partisanship with such serious problems requiring a quick conclusion and solution.

On the other side of the House, they disregard the interest of employers and employees and they also disregard the numerous economic problems this dispute is creating in Quebec. The previous speakers talked about that, therefore I will not give you the long list of businesses having a hard time these days, and the long list of employees being laid off. It is sad to see these people claim they represent the workers when, in fact, they are acting in their own best interest. Once again, they are just trying to fool the people. The Parti Quebecois simply does not want the system to work.

Since the Parti Quebecois was elected in Quebec City, they have showed us repeatedly, and they are demonstrating once again that they do not want federalism to work. Unfortunately, they apply this ideology to real problems affecting the public. They have left the Canada-wide negotiation table on environment, where Quebec was one of the main and most important participants. But since they do not want the system to work, they left the table. What annoys them right now is that you have here, on this side of the House, a responsible government, a government that is holding the course, that is also responding to the expectations of the provinces. We only have to look at the finance minister's budget.

(1125)

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Government Orders

Mr. Cauchon: I say that we only have to look at the finance minister's budget. To see how much this annoys them, we only have to listen to the opposition members yelling today. When they are annoyed, they yell and they yell loudly. That is what they are doing right now. The budget responds to the requests of the provinces. For instance, the Canada social transfer gives much more autonomy to the provinces and will allow them to refine their own social programs. That annoys the Bloc. They are now trying other political avenues, still for partisan purposes. What is sad this time is that they are playing party politics on the backs of workers across Canada. And that is mean-spirited.

The finance minister also responded to the expectations of the provinces in terms of national standards. The new Canada Transfer and the national standards will be worked out with the provinces. The provinces will be asked to discuss these standards with the Minister of Human Resources Development, so that they will reflect the reality of all the provinces, the Canadian reality.

In conclusion, there are on this side of the House, thank heavens, people who are capable of rising above political interests and capable of acting responsibly to ensure that we make decisions so that, in this case, the economy and labour relations can progress and, ultimately, all workers across Canada, the Canadian economy and Canada as a whole can benefit. The message that I am sending to the opposition parties is this one: stop acting for purely partisan motives. People told you that during the regional commissions; they want governments that deal with the real problems, and that is what we are doing in the case of the rail dispute. I congratulate the labour minister for her initiative, and I also commend the government for its responsible vision.

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Réf.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise and speak to Bill C-77. Part of the blame has already been put today on the Bloc Quebecois. You could also argue that they did not act as a national party nor in the interests of Canada, and that they only have the interests of Quebec at heart. Personally, I would blame the government far more than the Bloc.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Ringma: I say that for several reasons. First, over the last 18 months, the government reacted to things instead of acting, as it should have.

[*English*]

If we look at the longshoremen's strike as well as the rail strike, we can see that the government could foresee what was going to happen. The government knew there was a strike coming on. What did it do? Nothing. C'est le mot précis, rien.

We have a government that is reactive. We have any number of examples, one being the budget. Look at the government's action on the budget. It knew it had to do something but how much did it do? Just the bare minimum to keep things a little bit in balance. That is the government's approach throughout this.

Look at national defence and the situation with the Canadian forces. We have had this whole Somalia thing whirling around our ears for several years now. The government had the opportunity to take action on this but it did not.

(1130)

I blame the government for a lack of leadership and a lack of initiative. Let me remind the House of the airborne situation. The government saw what was coming. It was pressed as long ago as September 1994 to have an inquiry, get things out in the open, and find out what had gone wrong. The government said no, it would wait. It dragged its feet. When it stopped dragging its feet, it finally moved a baby step, not a big one, never enough to cope with what is needed.

We find exactly the same thing with Bill C-77. Bill C-77 is not a permanent solution. It gets us off the hook for another year or maybe two years. We will be voting for Bill C-77 because we have a Canadian problem on our hands. This just temporarily gets us off the hook. It is another baby step on the part of the government.

Permanent solutions are available. My hon. colleague from Lethbridge proposed a private member's bill, Bill C-262 a week or two ago. In Bill C-262 lie the seeds of a permanent solution the problem, not only in the rail area, but in the area of stevedoring as well. Why do we not come up with a permanent solution to these things? We have had 50 years of strikes. What does that mean? It means that the collective bargaining process in the area we are talking about and in the longshoring area is not working.

We had the recent strike in Vancouver. Incidentally no one else here was very concerned about it. "It is just Vancouver so we will legislate that quickly. No big problem".

I want to read a couple of quotes from two things. One is part of a letter from the Canadian Wheat Board to the government: "In a letter to your government dated April 1994, we the Wheat Board proposed that in those cases where a negotiated settlement could not be reached, a binding arbitration process, including final offer selection be instituted. This type of action would mean that a strike could be averted and the parties could continue to pursue collective bargaining. In short, the interests of all parties could be satisfied". This is the wheat board talking to the Government of Canada.

This went out a year ago in April 1994. It has been reiterated in March 1995. These are cries in the wilderness saying: "Government, please listen". Government has a responsibility to take a leadership role and it is not doing it.

Government Orders

I would like to read a line or two from a commission that looked into the Vancouver ports area several years ago. The commission stated: "There are two key impediments to the future growth of container traffic in the port of Vancouver. One is a lack of co-ordinated effort by various links in the intermodal chain. The other is a poor labour relations climate in the port of Vancouver which acts as a disincentive for potential investment in the port and its related intermodal linkage.

(1135)

To overcome both these impediments requires a new approach to managing human resources and organizational behaviour in the port than has been taking place in the past. The experience in Puget Sound ports, particularly in Tacoma, reveals that these elements can be adjusted, attitudes can be changed and reputations can be altered. The key to success seems to be the provision of leadership and effective organization in order to harness and channel available resources toward an identifiable goal". It is possible.

Let me cite one other example where the government could have done something in anticipation of a problem. It commissioned the Fraser report. A year ago the Minister of Human Resources Development appointed Paul Fraser to conduct an independent review of current labour issues on the railway. This report was supposed to be tabled in June 1994. It is still not on the scene. Where is the Fraser report? What is the government doing with it?

Was the minister so flustered by the lack of progress with his social programs that he scrapped this one as well? We have a new Minister of Labour in the House. Perhaps that minister will pick it up and do something with it.

The Fraser report, along with all the other reports that have been done ad nauseam, may have provided a long term solution to this continuing problem. However, the Fraser report is non-existent. Even if it did exist, it would be ignored. The point I am making is that the west coast terminal strike could have been avoided in the same way that this railway strike could have been avoided. We need a commission to come up with a permanent solution.

I stand here as a Reformer, saying this is what the government should do. However I know that not many across the way are listening. Sometimes I ask myself, are you being effective in Parliament, member for Nanaimo—Cowichan? A year ago I would have given you the answer: I really do not know. What am I doing here? What effect am I having? This year I have the answer. The answer is: If we stick to our principles, which we are doing, the markers are moving.

The Minister of Finance, for all the world, sounded like a Reformer a month or two ago. He sounded totally like a Reformer. He was getting the message. He was trying to get that message across through the budget.

Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is my duty and privilege to rise and speak to Bill C-77, an act to provide for the maintenance of railway operations and subsidiary services.

I wish to address my concerns to the railway employees who may be watching this important debate. For the reasons enunciated so clearly by the Minister of Labour, the Minister for International Trade and the Minister of Industry, the service you, the railway workers and management, provide is the lifeline and key component of the country's extensive transportation infrastructure.

You supply a vital service for the industrial trade and agricultural sectors of our growing economy. We in the House can appreciate concerns for your personal finances, but would you disagree with this member for Hamilton West when I say that the best job security you can have is to work for a company that makes a profit.

(1140)

The economic impact of the current rail strike has been made painfully clear to each and every one of us. We hear of it in our ridings. We see the impact on the operations of a broad range of large and small industries and employers.

In its opposition to the legislation, the Bloc Quebecois is parochially principled. The official opposition is pretending that it is acting in the interest of collective bargaining rights by criticizing the mediation and arbitration provisions of Bill C-77, the merits of which have not been questioned by the stakeholders.

By perpetuating this kind of navel gazing, the official opposition is not only missing the entire point of the legislation, it is also thumbing its nose at the real concerns of both labour and management.

While the opposition's thinly veiled political agenda continues to cripple the Canadian economy, 2,500 Canadian auto workers at Ford's St. Thomas, Ontario plant have been sent home because of shortages. Three thousand, nine hundred Canadian auto workers at Oakville and Windsor were forced to work half time this week. Seventy thousand commuters in Montreal and Toronto are lined up on the highways and at the bus stations facing long delays getting to and from work. Not to mention it is estimated the national rail strike could end up costing this great country, a country in a period of growth, \$3 to \$5 billion by the time it is finally resolved.

In the same way that railway employees and management would like to stabilize their labour related economic circumstances, we in government must do everything we can to stabilize the nation's economy. In short, from an economic standpoint we have to be productive to survive. It is that simple.

The transportation critic for the Bloc Quebecois went beet red in the face a few moments ago decrying the economic advantages of management. I agree with the opposition critic. They

Government Orders

are outrageous but there are two sides to that story. There are two sides to every story.

He conveniently forgets about the 600 employees on full salary who are not working under the current arrangement. If CN needs 250 employees in Calgary, not one of the 600 fully salaried, non-working employees in the east can be moved to Calgary to fill those jobs.

An hon. member: Industrial relations.

Mr. Keyes: There are two sides to every story, I say to the hon. member.

It has been established that such labour provisions could end up costing CN \$77 million over the next five years. I repeat, the best job security an employee can have is to work for a company that makes a profit.

The example given by the Bloc transport critic and the example given by me just now have brought negotiations to an impasse. I appeal to the members opposite to end the petty politicking.

Almost two years of negotiations have produced no progress on any of those major issues. The Bloc wants another 60 days of mediation, which neither side in this dispute wants, only to eventually and most probably bring us full circle back to where we are at this moment in the House.

I ask the Bloc Quebecois, I ask the official opposition, to think of their constituents who must bear the economic burden of the Bloc's opposition to Bill C-77. Think of the many workers across the country who are waiting, who are praying to get back to work. There is nothing to be gained by waiting but there is much that is being lost.

(1145)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Madam Speaker, first of all I may recall that whatever hon. members opposite may have said, the reason we are here today and the trains are still not running is not because of the Bloc Quebecois but because the government refuses to accept a universal labour principle: mediation.

They want to impose arbitration, they want to impose terms and conditions of employment and give the public the impression that the Bloc Quebecois is to blame, although from day one, on Monday and the day after, the Bloc Quebecois, through its leader, offered to settle the dispute immediately if the government accepted mediation. We in the Bloc are just as aware as you that this is a serious matter. We realize, as you do, that the workers must get back to work as soon as possible. But that is not the point of this debate.

Today's debate is about the fact that the government absolutely wants to prescribe arbitration and impose terms and condi-

tions of employment, not about mediation, a mechanism that works very well. Just this past week in the Port of Montreal, negotiations led to a settlement, acceptable to both parties, that will provide for good labour relations.

I speak here as a member of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development which examined this bill clause by clause on Wednesday, under a gag order. This is the first time in the history of this Parliament that a government imposed time allocation on the consideration of a bill in committee. And we only had four hours to consider it. We nevertheless proceeded to clause by clause consideration.

Also and above all, I speak as the member for a riding that has a high concentration of railway activity. I want to talk about the railway centre in Charny, created mainly because of that activity. I regularly meet people who work in this town. I visit them regularly, almost daily, although perhaps a little less, of late, because I have to be in Ottawa several days a week. I speak on the behalf not only of the rail workers but of the people whose livelihood depends on the railways. In my riding, there is no problem. Business people realize that the railways are important. The government obviously does not, since it let this dispute deteriorate.

Without wishing to make this a personal crusade, I want to say that I listen to what my constituents have to say and represent their concerns. CN workers in my riding are so concerned about the future of a business to which they are very much attached that they made the president of CN a purchase offer. Is this evidence of bad faith, when people believe so strongly in the business they work for that they want to buy it? They want to keep their company alive, unlike Mr. Tellier who ever since he was appointed has been doing a job on CN.

The hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans said earlier that Mr. Tellier is now the highest paid public servant, with an annual salary of \$345,000 plus a personal expense allowance of \$51,000. He also asked his company for an interest-free loan so he could acquire a house in Westmount. He even said in the paper that if CN had not agreed, he would have turned down the job. Poor Mr. Tellier.

Last year, he came to Charny to explain to workers the reasons for cutbacks and job cuts. The workers told him they did not see why he was cutting positions because conductors were working overtime, were always on standby with a pagette and sometimes worked 14 days running.

(1150)

Why cut jobs under these circumstances? It would be much better to have more people working in order for everyone to have better working conditions and a better quality of life. But no, he did not listen. Mr. Tellier is not the only one causing problems at the CN level. Some senior officers, though not many, have left, and each time it ended with an agreement of several hundred

thousands of dollars. In some cases, the amounts even came close to \$600,000 in addition to pension benefits. Is that the sort of example to give when workers are being asked to tighten their belts? My constituents say no, and do not accept such poor service. I believe that if people knew what is going on at the CN, they would not accept it either.

What is lacking is information. But if you want information from the CN—I sat on the transport committee last year. Six months later, the president of the CN still has not given any answers to the legitimate requests made by the opposition in committee. He has not answered his employees either.

The amendments proposed by the Bloc Québécois today relate mainly to mediation and seek to eliminate the word “arbitration”, the process that the government wants to impose. The main problem is clause 12, which we want to amend in such a way that the commission it refers to will be guided by the need for good relations between the employer and unions and, to this end, promote terms and conditions of employment that take into account both the workers’ acquired rights, the economic situation and the competitiveness of the whole Canadian rail system. But the government refuses to support such a balanced approach, which would take into account both the needs of the workers and the economic situation. No CN employee wants to hurt the economy, quite the opposite. But we can see that the government, that wants to privatize the CN, is eager to sell it off, bit by bit, to companies whose interests sometimes do not match those of the rail industry. We have seen people in that situation in the case of Murray Bay for example. Those people are truckers. What interests are they promoting?

There is no enthusiasm whatsoever. I have been saying it over and over again and I have been in contact with people in the rail industry in my region for many years. The poor labour climate imposed by management drags on and on. Unfortunately, the same executive team which was in place under the Tories is still there to finish the dirty job. This government said that it wanted to put an end to this situation, but in actual fact, through its decisions, it continues to implement the policies of the Conservative Party. People in Quebec have trouble understanding why it is so. There is something else Quebecers have trouble understanding. In Quebec, like anywhere else, there have been strikes, yet people have come to accept the principle of the right to strike. People understand the importance of mediation, and of negotiating working conditions. This creates a better climate and this is a more productive way of doing things. Recently, at MIL Davie, workers accepted the working conditions which had been negotiated that way, because they understood how important those conditions were for their company, its survival, and also its improved operations.

Government Orders

People balk at the working conditions the government wants to impose. The government is refusing to enforce appropriate legislation. There is a labour dispute at Ogilvie, which has been dragging on forever. Scabs have been allowed in, even though this is happening in Quebec. Why? Because of the federal legislation.

To conclude, I will say that Quebec is a distinct society. In Quebec, we refuse to work in a climate of confrontation. From now on, we want working conditions in Quebec to be democratically negotiated.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

(1155)

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to the speech by the member opposite and I am wondering if he has read, like I did, what one of his own colleagues, the member for Longueuil, said:

I receive lots of congratulation phone calls. I only got calls of praise. Even good sovereignists and some mayors called me to pledge their support.

He was speaking of the fact that he sided against his party, the Bloc Québécois. A bit further on, when some people threatened to penalize him for the stance he had taken, the member for Longueuil said:

I do not see how voters could penalize me. It seems to me that exactly the opposite is happening. We have a major problem because transportation is almost at a standstill. These people must go back to work.

This is what the Bloc member said of his colleagues—at least, he was a member of the Bloc Québécois when this interview was made. The member for Rosemont must know that.

This strike is damaging all parts of Canada, all across the country. We must put a stop to it. I received calls from constituents and also from striking railway workers. In a specific case, a friend of mine told me—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Boudria: Perhaps this concept is beyond the hon. members across the way, but sometimes voters are friends with their MP. I realize this does not happen often with the Bloc Québécois members.

You know, at the risk of boasting, when I received 80 per cent of the votes in my riding, some of them at least were by friends.

So, this voter called me to say it was impossible to live on \$3 a day strike pay. The hon. members opposite do not live on \$3 a day. No, they get their full salary. And so they should, but they should remember that some people are not as fortunate as they are.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Let us look at some of the effects of this. General Motors and Ford employ around 21,000 people in the greater Toronto area and their plants have shut down. They cannot ship all the cars they are selling and get all the parts to keep those plants running by truck traffic alone. It is impossible. They need the rail sector. That is why it is there.

[Translation]

The Canadian Manufacturers Association said that the strike cost the Canadian economy between \$3 billion and \$5 billion a week. I have just heard the Bloc Québécois finance critic. Perhaps he was hoping that no one would hear him. He said that this was more than Canada's GDP. I hope Canadians in the manufacturing sector heard the words of the Bloc Québécois finance critic.

We cannot go on like this. I beseech the hon. members across the floor to do their duty and vote with the government to end this strike. Otherwise, if they want to vote against it, I will respect their decision to do so. But I would ask them to please stop blocking—even though they are Bloc members—the entire country as they are today. They can vote against the bill, but they must allow it to be passed.

Even in Quebec, Kruger in Trois-Rivières, Stone Consolidated Inc. in Port-Alfred, Pétromont, Shell in Montreal, the port of Bécancour, Alcan, ADI, Reynolds and Lauralco—they all need rail service. These people need us to end the strike today.

(1200)

A few minutes ago, I telephoned the St-Isidore de Prescott farmers' co-operative, in my riding of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. The hon. members opposite who take the 417 highway to get home will undoubtedly remember passing by the lovely community of St-Isidore in my riding. Workers at the St-Isidore farmers' co-operative told me today that soya beans cost 20 per cent more this week.

Some hon. members: No, no.

Mr. Boudria: Oh, no? Well, I am telling the members opposite to dial the following number: area code (613) 524-2828. Ask the people at the St-Isidore co-operative. They will tell you: farm products now cost 20 per cent more in my riding because of the Bloc's actions today, because of the Bloc members' failure to fulfil their public duty.

[English]

And if that was not enough, we are sitting in the House of Commons today. Of course all of us work full time in this business. If we were not here doing this, presumably we would be home meeting with our constituents. So either way we would be working.

In order to keep the House of Commons sitting today it costs the taxpayers of Canada \$17,125 an hour more than what it normally costs. I repeat, \$17,125 an hour more. Tomorrow if we sit, it will be more like \$25,000 an hour. I say to the MPs across, if by some misfortune, some unlikely proposition they were to refuse unanimous consent later on today to do third reading of this bill—

Mr. Milliken: I cannot imagine that.

Mr. Boudria: I cannot imagine it either, but if they do, they are going to cost the taxpayers of Canada another \$100,000. When people are brought in it is for a minimum of four hours. Therefore it will cost another \$100,000 to prolong their ego trip for one more day. It is going to cost another \$100,000 to the good people of Canada who are paying the salaries of the members across the way along with the rest of us in this House.

[Translation]

Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe): Why are you afraid of our amendments?

Mr. Boudria: I would like to say to the hon. members opposite, who have not stopped making a ruckus, that I understand their agitation at this moment; they may be a little embarrassed. The hon. members opposite are finally beginning to see the light, and that makes them restless. They look like they are on the defensive.

An hon. member: What was the number again?

Mr. Boudria: 524-2828. I repeat for the information of hon. members opposite that is the telephone number for the St-Isidore farmers' co-operative. And that is but one of the farmers' co-operatives in my riding. There are others, farmers in my riding which the Bloc purports to defend from time to time, Canadian farmers. I say to them: Wake up. Help the Canadian farming industry. Help Canadian industry in general, from coast to coast. Help everybody who takes commuter trains to get to work, be it in Montreal, Toronto or elsewhere. They too want to have transportation to get home and see their families.

I say to the hon. members opposite and to the leader of the Bloc that hundreds and hundreds, even thousands of people in Toronto and Montreal would like to be like everybody else and go home, but are unable to do so at present. Why? Because of the strike which could have been ended a week ago, had the hon. members opposite given their consent.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe): We could have ended it a week ago.

Mr. Boudria: Why did they not consent?

[English]

It is because of the ego trip they are on. That is the only reason. Instead of doing what is right, they did what a handful of people asked them, told them or ordered them to do, instead of doing what their constituents want. That is the sad reality. That is what the Bloc Québécois has been doing for the last week,

Government Orders

initially supported by the NDP just in case some Canadians had forgotten. But even the NDP came around. That tells us that even the people in the NDP finally got some common sense. Well, I hope the Bloc Quebecois gets some now.

(1205)

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Reform Party with regard to these amendments.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, at the invitation of the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, we checked at the telephone number he gave, and everything is fine.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Does the hon. member for Rosemont have a point of order?

Mr. Tremblay: Madam Speaker, could the hon. member be asked to retract what he said, since the facts were wrong?

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I called from the lobby. I was told that soya beans cost 20 per cent more today.

Mr. Bouchard: We just called.

Mr. Tremblay: Madam Speaker, the hon. member did not retract what he said, although a mistake was clearly made.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Order.

Mr. Bellehumeur: I just made the call myself.

Mr. Boudria: They cost 20 per cent more.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Order. Order, please. I would remind all of the members who rose on the point of order that it was a point of debate. I now recognize the hon. member for Lethbridge.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge): Madam Speaker, looking at the situation before us we can say that the delay is unfortunate for all Canadians to a great extent. The responsibility today certainly lies with the Bloc Quebecois as its members come here and go through a lot of political gymnastics in an attempt to prove something to Canada. That is absolutely wrong.

The amendment before us asks for what is called a mediation commission. If there was sincerity behind that amendment I would buy it. However, when I listen to the Bloc present its case to this House, the case is one of political expediency. It is not to change the law of the country nor to bring about a common sense solution to the problem. Therefore I do not buy it, nor do my Reform Party colleagues.

It is unforgiving for a political party to play with our economy. Ministers of this government have outlined situations that are costing Canadians billions of dollars. My colleagues have given examples where industries are hurt, where factories and a variety of businesses which are very dependent upon shipping in this country are hurt to a significant degree. And politics are being played in this House to delay the inevitable, that the workers must go back to work and that we must get the transportation system back on track.

That is where we are today. As a common sense political party, we believe it is time to act. The Minister of Labour has brought legislation before the House. We are prepared to support it and move it as quickly as possible through the final stages.

(1210)

I know we have been critical of the Minister of Labour. However, we have also generalized it to government saying that the government should have acted sooner and not only brought in back to work legislation but also put in place a long term solution to the problem.

The Minister of Labour, as I listen to her in her new assignment, is committed. We are going to hold her accountable for this on behalf of the Reform Party. We will also hold her accountable as the representative of the Liberal Government of Canada. From what I understand, the commission which is going to be established will bring about a long term solution to the problem. We want that to happen.

I have heard other comments in the House today that would only support that general direction of government, the somewhat commitment of government. I hope it is a real commitment. I hope it is not just political statements for expedient reasons at this point and then six months to a year from now we have no action by government toward a long term solution.

As I listened to the Minister for International Trade today he said: "Rail services should be available so that our goods can reach our ports and move across the U.S.-Canadian border". We agree with that. That is the way it should be. The minister also went on to say that we need a more satisfactory way to resolve disputes in our rail system, which is absolutely true. We support that. That is a statement of commitment by the minister as I read it. I hope that minister will follow through and with the Minister of Labour will bring about a long term solution.

The minister for trade also went on to say in his remarks to this assembly: "Early resolution of the rail strike which is causing such problems to our rail system is certainly necessary". We agree with that as well. That is why we are here today.

That is the position of the Reform Party. We want action. We want action immediately to deal with this matter.

Government Orders

It is my hope that the Bloc Québécois will reconsider delaying this debate until tomorrow so we can forgo further expense. The government whip has indicated there are enormous costs in continuing the operation of this assembly, not only for Saturday but on Sunday as well. These unnecessary costs are being placed upon Canadians because of one political party that wants to play a political game, which is completely unsatisfactory.

Where are we then as the Reform Party? What is our position? What do we think should be done at this point?

First, we are prepared to support the current legislation, Bill C-77, that will put the workers back to work and our transportation in operation as of this coming Monday.

Second, we are concerned that the government did not put the legislation in place at an earlier date. There were many signals. My colleague, the critic for labour, indicated in his remarks that the signals were there and that the government should have put in place legislation upon which we could have acted more quickly.

Third, we think there is a long term solution to this problem. Bill C-262 was voted on in this House earlier this week. A principle in that bill is supported by a number of groups across Canada. We said clearly in Bill C-262 that there should be binding arbitration in place to bring about a conclusion to a dispute. The two parties in that process would each place their final offer on the table, the arbitrator would choose, and our rail system would continue to work.

Some people say that is the wrong way to handle the problem, that we violate some basic principles of the collective bargaining process. I do not believe that is true. In this circumstance there is a difference.

(1215)

In collective bargaining circumstances we have management and employees. They bargain back and forth through the process and reach a point where there can either be a lockout or a strike. Under most circumstances that is acceptable.

However, when we are looking at the transportation system of the country there is a third party that loses its rights, that does not have any say in the process but pays the bill. The most obvious example is the agricultural community, the agricultural producer or the processor of agricultural products. We are required as farmers or agricultural producers to ship our goods via the railway. When there are no other options we must place the goods on the railway, get them to port, into the hold of the boat and into the international market.

If we cannot have a reliable transportation system there will be a huge economic impact on the agricultural sectors. We have seen that some 15 times in the last 25 years. Billions of dollars

have been lost in that industry. The third party, the producer, was the victim. He had no say but paid the bills. That is unacceptable.

With Bill C-77 we will have binding arbitration in place that will be the solution to the problem. It has been the solution to the problem some 14 or 15 times in the last 25 years. It has been the only way to settle the problem. It has been satisfactory to management and employees. Government has had no other alternative but to knee-jerk and bring in special legislation to put people back to work.

Our recommendation as the Reform Party is that we should have that mechanism in place on a permanent basis so that when the two parties get to a point where they have to settle a dispute arbitration kicks in and the solution is there for the problem.

[Translation]

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I must admit that I am saddened today to see that we are unable to reach an agreement on a serious problem which is hurting the country and its citizens so much. I would have thought that when faced with such a big challenge, we could have given each other a hand and have found a solution that would make everybody happy. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

That is sad, because the strike costs \$500 million a day. By the end of the strike, say the workers come back on Monday, we will have lost \$5 billion. Just break that figure down into how much each citizen of the country lost. It is a huge sum.

Obviously businesses and stores almost everywhere in Canada are affected. Obviously Canadians are all affected. It is having very, very dire and, in some cases, brutal repercussions for people. We often forget that workers are also affected. Not only those on strike, not only those who are locked out, but also those prevented from working because of what is going on. I find that so sad.

You have all heard that the Bloc is touting itself as the defender of workers' rights. But we have to ask ourselves one basic question. Which workers are they defending?

(1220)

Is it the workers of the industries listed here: the Himont petrochemical plant in Varennes, where production has dropped by 25 per cent; ICI, a petrochemical plant in Dalhousie, with a 33 per cent drop in production; Donohue, a pulp and paper plant in Saint-Félicien, Quebec, now closed, with 100 people out of a job; Donohue, a pulp and paper plant in Clermont, slated to close down, laying off 75 employees; Franceau, in Chambord, where 190 employees stand to be laid off; Univers, in Val d'Or, which will throw 16 employees out of work; Forpan Inc., in Val d'Or,

where 146 employees could be out of work; Panval Inc., in Soyabec, slated to close down, laying off 238 employees; or PanFiber, in Mont-Laurier, where 101 employees could be laid off? Are those the people the Bloc Quebecois seeks to protect?

You know as well as I do that what they are trying to do, of course, is to disguise their true intentions. Why is it that the Bloc said absolutely nothing when the government forced the long-shoremen to resume work in Vancouver? They did not say a word. Why is that? It is obvious. They have a big problem. They went too far. They did not understand. They have not been sensitive enough to the rest of the country. Now, they are looking for a way to put that behind them. They made a bad move; it was poor judgment on their part.

Let us look at the damage done by this strike. I will quote from an article published yesterday, March 24, in *The Ottawa Sun*. I want to make sure I quote it correctly.

[English]

It is the height of irresponsibility for Bouchard to stall back to work legislation.

The strike is costing industry \$500 million a day in lost production and sales. By the time the legislation is eventually passed by Parliament on Sunday, the strike will have cost the economy \$5 billion.

The dispute has delayed shipments of potash, grain, coal, ore, forestry products, heavy industrial components, processed food, chemicals, manufactured products and other goods.

For Canada's farmers, the strike could not have come at a worst time. It is the busiest time of year, with nearly 25,000 rail cars on sidings waiting to deliver the rest of last summer's harvest.

If we were to ask my colleague from Brandon—Souris how the people in his riding are affected, he would corroborate that it is disastrous for the farmer and certainly the western Canadian farmer.

The articles continues:

Tens of thousands of workers across the country have been laid off because of the disruption, while many more are being forced to work half shifts.

At least 70,000 commuters in Toronto and Montreal face the inconvenience of finding other ways to get to work.

The stalling tactics are certainly linked to supporting the referendum. Referring to the province of Quebec the article states:

The strike has hurt the province's manufacturers, aluminium industry and its pulp and paper companies.

For example, forest giant Repap Enterprises faces imminent shutdowns and layoffs affecting 5,000 workers that could paralyse entire communities.

One of the reasons why Bouchard is being obstructionist is to keep good relations with Quebec's militant unions, which are big boosters of independence.

Clearly, Bouchard feels he can't afford to anger the unions which are one of the few organized groups in Quebec willing to jump over the cliff to reach the separatist dream.

Government Orders

The article is a little harsh and goes on to state:

Bouchard has demonstrated to Quebecers that he's clueless about bread and butter issues. If he doesn't know the impact that the strike is having in Quebec then imagine what would happen if the province ever separated from Canada.

How can Quebecers put trust in his lofty claims that there won't be any economic fallout if Quebec separates?

Obviously they can't if he isn't able to see the consequences of a rail strike which is essential to the entire Canadian economy.

That is what the article states. It is a condemnation of the actions of Bloc Quebecois members. They show quite clearly that what they are trying to do is take advantage of the situation for their own political gain.

(1225)

[Translation]

There are two basic principles to consider. We all agree that, as far as possible, work agreements should be negotiated, that labour disputes should be settled through negotiation. Ideally, we all wish it could be so. But do you not think there is another principle that is equally important and sometimes more important here, namely the protection of the public, the protection of this country's economy to which we owe the quality of life we enjoy in Canada at this time? That is what we are doing today. It is not that we do not want workers to reach an agreement with their employers. We gave them time and no agreement was reached. Now, in the face of the damage done by this strike, we have to take action. We have no choice.

Many Bloc members mentioned that the bill will be used in other sectors in the future, because of what we are doing today. I agree and I challenge them by asking: Why not begin to co-operate in an attempt to settle this situation? Let us put Canadians back to work and let us co-operate in looking for solutions that will ensure that the situation never occurs again, either in the railway industry or elsewhere. How can we simultaneously protect our workers and our people? That is the challenge.

I conclude my speech by commending the Minister of Labour for her excellent work. Well done, Madam Minister! The job has not been easy. We are not enjoying this. We believe that agreements and labour disputes should be negotiated. But the time has come to give priority to the country and its people.

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Madam Speaker, we had no choice but to agree immediately to the request courteously expressed a few minutes ago by our colleague from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who said that we could verify what he said by calling the co-op he referred to. We hastened to do so and I can now reassure this House, which was needlessly alarmed by my esteemed colleague's remarks. First

Government Orders

of all, this co-op is not out of stock. Second, soy prices did not rise this week but dropped by 10 cents a bushel as of last night.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mercier: There are reassuring news which completely contradict the comments made by the hon. member across the way, which suggest he was badly misinformed, if I may use this euphemism. I have every reason to believe that other alarmist information we have been given on the consequences of the strike is in the same category.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mercier: The current rail crisis would never have hurt the country's economy and poisoned, as it is doing, labour relations in the railway sector for long, if the Canada Labour Code had contained some of the provisions in Quebec's Labour Code, which are aimed at settling this type of dispute while keeping damage to a minimum. It is easy to imagine what would have happened, at least in Quebec, if our province had jurisdiction over the railways, or better yet, if Quebec was sovereign. Let us imagine, for the sake of comparison, how the current rail crisis would have been handled in a sovereign Quebec if the current provincial legislation had still been in effect.

Let us suppose, first of all, that, in both Canada and the State of Quebec, railway unions decide to go on strike after negotiations reach an impasse. In Canada, after giving notice, the unions go on strike, leading to immediate confrontation. Other unions are locked out. In the State of Quebec, however, things would not degenerate so quickly, Madam Speaker.

In the State of Quebec, after assessing a strike's potential risks to the public, the government issues an order-in-council.

(1230)

With this order, the onus is on both parties to negotiate, before going on strike, what we call essential services, that is the basic services to be provided during the strike in order for the users to be somewhat disturbed by the dispute. After all, it is a matter of a balance of power and not a complete stalemate.

Then you have different possible scenarios and various steps, and I will not go into the details, but at the end of the day, the government has the final word. In light of a report prepared by the board of essential services which was established to that effect, if the government considers the agreed services are not sufficient, it can suspend the right to strike until both parties agree to their satisfaction or the unions submit unilaterally a list of services that the government finds satisfactory. Then the strike is authorized and may start. That is the end of the first step which is aimed at humanizing the strike to come, a step that does not exist in Canada.

So, now there is a strike in the State of Quebec. But it is a civilized strike, if I may say so, within a well defined framework. Of course users are not pleased but their activities are not totally disrupted. What if the unions do not respect their commitments? What if the agreed services are not provided? The government will then suspend the right to strike and, in case of violation, submit the matter to the Attorney General to obtain an injunction, possibly.

The use of civilized dispute settlement mechanisms prescribed by the Quebec law does not exclude firmness, if required. Negotiations would continue throughout this civilized strike. The government might be forced to legislate in the end, but the right to strike would not be undermined and the economy would not suffer as much.

This is how things would be done in a sovereign Quebec or, if you prefer, not to prejudge the matter, if the Canada Labour Code contained some of the clauses in the Quebec Code. The outcome would be different if, instead of the confrontation made inevitable by the Canada Labour Code which is brutal and basic, we had more civilized exchanges which would allow for the inclusion of some of our own legal clauses, which are based on the need in a real democracy to reconcile the citizens' right to strike and the employers' and users' right to essential services.

In fact, the Canadian law practically led inevitably to the current confrontation and only by agreeing to the principle of mediation, which was proposed Monday by our party, could this House end the conflict without hitting very hard the workers who will not forget. How can we avoid a tragic situation in a country where, in case of a labour dispute within a public utility, the government—after 24 hours of strike by workers—has, under the terms of its legislation, no choice but to allow the strike to go on and nearly bring to a standstill the economy and operations in some sectors or deny the workers' right to strike by unilaterally putting an end to the strike after 24 hours?

The die is cast, as far as the current dispute is concerned. If this can be of any consolation to you, this assembly will soon have the opportunity to avoid similar disputes in future by amending the Canadian Labour Code in such a way that labour disputes could from now on be settled in the same civilized and efficient way as is done in Quebec.

Indeed, my colleague from Manicouagan just presented a bill—Bill C-317—to introduce in the Canada Labour Code provisions similar to those we have in ours. This bill provides for the maintenance of all essential services in case of a strike and for the creation of a board to this end. In turn, it prohibits as in Quebec an employer from using the services of a person not usually in his employ during a strike or a lockout.

The current crisis in this country will not have hurt workers, employers and users in vain, if it makes us aware of a terrible deficiency of the Canadian Labour Code and if it leads us, in order to remedy it, to enact Bill C-317, introduced by my

Government Orders

colleague for Manicouagan. If we indeed enact that bill, Canada—when Quebec has become a sovereign country—will have nothing to envy it as far as labour legislation is concerned.

(1235)

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I feel I must contribute to the very important debate taking place here in the House today, because the official opposition has shown that it is unable to take a just and fair decision on issues of importance to all Canadians.

[English]

We have faced a serious strike situation for over a week now, a strike that is costing Canadians millions of dollars and causing thousands of Canadians to lose work, time and money. The only reason this loss is continuing is the obstruction of the official opposition.

I want to make it perfectly clear in all my remarks that the blame for the obstruction rests squarely with the official opposition. It has prevented the House from dealing with this bill in a manner that is normal in situations of this kind; that is, in an expeditious and fair way.

I know the Reform Party has assisted the government to the extent that it has supported the legislation and has agreed to time allocation in respect of various stages of the bill in order to expedite passage. I appreciate that support very much and acknowledge it.

On the other hand, the hon. member for Lethbridge in his speech this morning sought to criticize the government. When the government has acted so well it is difficult to find a way to criticize. He was really stretching things by arguing that somehow the government should have acted last week.

Let us go back to the situation of last week. I remind the hon. member that while there was a strike by a few workers with CP, CP service was virtually continuous. It was working. Deliveries were still be made. CP was still running.

The hon. member knows that. Surely he is not expecting the government to step in and legislate an end to a modest strike of that kind. The hon. member in his speech this morning was doing his best to make it appear that somehow the government was at fault for this strike when he knows that is not the case.

The government has acted extremely well. It has done exactly what it should have done. When it became apparent that there was a national strike the first thing it did was give notice of intention to introduce this bill by issuing a special notice paper last week, or asking that one be issued. He knows that one was issued on Sunday morning. If it were not for that we would not

be able to complete the bill as quickly as we are moving. I regret it is as slow as it is.

The hon. member knows that I on behalf of the government and the ministers of the crown who have been in the House have tried all week to get the official opposition to abandon its rather ridiculous policy of obstructing this legislation and allowing the bill to proceed.

[Translation]

Last Monday, the members of the Bloc Québécois decided to obstruct this bill and they have continued to obstruct it all week. If they had had more than thirteen members in the House Thursday morning, we would not have had this debate today or Sunday. This bill will perhaps be passed Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. Another three terrible days for Canada. What is the point of all this?

[English]

The hon. members opposite should really be ashamed of the position they have taken in obstructing this. I recognize their right to oppose this legislation and speak against it and vote against it if they want to do so, but instead they have used the rules of procedure in the House to full advantage to obstruct the passage of this bill and put Canadians out of work. That is a disgrace.

Always in the past when this kind of legislation has been introduced in the House—I remember we had some when we were in opposition and I have sat where the hon. members opposite are sitting today—we would make our objections very clear and very plain, and so did the NDP. In the end we allowed the legislation to go through in an expeditious manner because we recognized the public interest demands that when there is a national strike of this kind paralysing industries across Canada Parliament must act to bring the strike to an end. We allowed Parliament to act and make its decision in a rapid, responsible way.

Hon. members from the New Democratic Party obstructed the bill on Monday with some glee, as one would expect from that group. As one of the editorials I was reading this morning said, they are bought and paid for by the labour movement so we would expect they might object to this. We support labour as well. Many people who are members of unions work and support the Liberal Party.

(1240)

[Translation]

The members of the Bloc Québécois say that they have a monopoly on this sort of support, but that is not the case. Many workers belonging to unions in Quebec vote for the Liberal Party and the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, who finds this so amusing, knows very well that it is the truth.

*Government Orders**[English]*

I do not like to cross the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot at all times. He tries his best. He knows these people are voting Liberal for a very good reason. We are providing good leadership and good government.

Most of these people want to work. Most of the people who are out on strike do not want to be earning \$3 a day in strike pay. They want to be working and making money. Before the strike I had occasion to speak with various employees of VIA Rail in my travels.

They said if there is a strike, for heaven's sake legislate them back quickly, they do not want to be out for long. The Bloc Québécois is obstructing and holding these people from their work and their jobs.

What does that do for those Canadians? What does it do for their annual salary? It reduces what they can make in a year. The members of the Bloc Québécois should be ashamed of themselves for this obstruction.

I want to deal with the New Democratic Party briefly. The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell and the Minister for International Trade want to hear about the New Democratic Party.

I do not see the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona but I know he is here in spirit. He was quite concerned on Monday that we not proceed with the bill. He refused consent. By Tuesday those members were silent. By Wednesday they were saying get it done. They have been saying it ever since. They at least saw the light.

I invite hon. members of the Bloc Québécois to have a little look around them. Look for the light. Then the members will say yes to this bill right away. There is no point in holding this up any further. They have obstructed the bill all week. We tried on Monday to introduce the bill and get it passed. We tried on Tuesday. We had the bill introduced and asked for unanimous consent to deal with it in all stages. That was refused at least twice during the day.

An hon. member: They do not care about Canadians.

Mr. Milliken: Or the workers. On Wednesday we had the bill for second reading. We asked for consent to put it through all stages. That was refused. Therefore we used time allocation and got the bill through second reading. We used time allocation again to get it through the committee. It was not obstructed Wednesday night in committee.

We had it reported on Thursday and what did we do on Thursday? We asked for unanimous consent to pass the bill on Thursday. It was refused. We asked for consent to pass it on Friday. It was refused. We asked again on Friday.

Fortunately because the members of the Bloc were not here in sufficient numbers we fortunately got the right to sit on Saturday and Sunday to deal with it more quickly than we otherwise would but that was a stroke of luck on our part.

I am sure it was not deliberate on their part that there were only 13 here when there should have been 25. I am glad that there were not 25 here.

Here we are on Saturday debating report stage. When we have completed the votes on report stage and dealt with all the amendments, the 42 amendments the members of the Bloc Québécois have moved, we will have the opportunity to proceed with third reading.

[Translation]

I urge members opposite to consider the situation of all those who would rather be working today. It is important for them that we vote at third reading as soon as possible and I hope that members opposite will give their consent today, so that we can vote at third reading this afternoon.

[English]

The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot has the best interests of the workers of Quebec and Canada at heart. If he does and if he considers their plight, he knows in his heart of hearts the best thing he could do today is vote to put them back to work; not just the people who are on strike but those who have been laid off as a result of the strike because that is the most unfair part of all.

Through no fault of their own other Canadians, thousands of them, are losing money because of the rail strike. It should be ended. It should have been ended several days ago.

(1245)

The Bloc Québécois through its obstruction and delay has denied these Canadians the right to earn a living. It is unfair. I invite it to join us today to end this strike.

[Translation]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, before giving the speech I had prepared, I would like to comment on some of the allegations made by the hon. members opposite.

Someone said a moment ago that the new Minister of Labour is to be commended for taking dynamic and aggressive action immediately upon assuming her duties. Indeed, we could not help but notice ourselves that the big companies and the rich and the powerful did not take long to recognize that she was on their side. In no time they were putting in their order: "Please, Madam Minister, bring in special legislation because we are unable to reach a compromise through the civilized and democratic negotiation process that normally characterizes labour relation".

So, the new Minister of Labour is perfectly comfortable with her new Liberal persona. She has adopted the Liberal philosophy that says that when one cannot get something according to democratic means, one imposes it. That is exactly what the Liberals did with the patriation of the constitution. It is nothing new.

Hence the comment by a member opposite that the support the Bloc gives workers proves that a sovereign Quebec would be governed by unions. A sovereign Quebec would be governed by ordinary citizens. And if there are only ordinary people in the unions, well it is just too bad for the opposition because it is ordinary people who, democratically, will govern Quebec.

We are being accused of defending unions because, they say, unions are separatist. But who are the Liberals defending? Why do they support so many large companies in this dispute? Why have they asked these companies not to go too far in the negotiations? They told them not to worry, that if they did not succeed, the government would pass a bill.

That is what you get from being a friend of the Liberals. Maybe some of these large companies make hefty contributions to the Liberal Party election fund.

The Minister of Labour has named many companies. She gave a list of companies that are threatening to close down because of this labour dispute. But did we hear her mention one worker, any one of the 30,000 workers who are affected too by this strike?

Mr. Boudria said earlier—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I must remind the hon. member that he should refer to a member using the name of the constituency.

Mr. Laurin: I am sorry, Madam Speaker. The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell said earlier that one of his constituents called him. It is another one, not the one mentioned earlier, he was not the right one. So, another of his constituents who is on strike complained that he could hardly live with a \$3 a day strike pay. Let him find comfort in the fact that the legislation the government is trying to pass and that he will have to live with for at least two years is not worth a nickel.

The government's contentions are hogwash. We have to put an end to that strike, they say. We are willing to put an end to the strike, and we agree that we could have done it before. But we feel that we should not do it at all costs.

With its special legislation, the Liberal government wants to put the train back on the track as fast as possible, with no thought to the consequences. If the train, meanwhile, runs over the employees, that is too bad; so be it. The train must keep moving, no matter who suffers. In the long run, a return to work under

Government Orders

such conditions will doom the railroad companies to several years of completely deteriorated labour relations.

We keep saying to the government that it can still reach an amicable settlement and that if it wants to resolve this conflict this afternoon, we will not object, provided that it agrees with the very humane amendments which we have proposed to solve the issue.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It being 12:51 p.m., pursuant to an order made earlier this day and under the provisions of Standing Order 78(2), it is my duty to interrupt these proceedings and put all questions necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

[*Translation*]

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

We shall now proceed to the second group of motions which includes Motions Nos. 4, 9, 13, 18, 23, 27, 32, 37 and 41.

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, I rise to ask for clarification. You have not put the question to the House with regard to the second group of motions. What is the procedure? We want to vote on this, we want to give our point of view. Naturally, we support Mrs. Lalonde's motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): First I read each motion in the second group, and then I put the question.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ) moves:

Government Orders

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-77, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 44, on page 5 and lines 1 to 5, on page 6, with the following:

“(3) The employer and the union may agree on the appointment of a person as Chairperson, but where they do not agree on a Chairperson, the Minister shall, after obtaining the agreement of the official opposition in the House of Commons, appoint as Chairperson a person whom the Minister considers to be qualified.

(4) After the employer and the union representing the bargaining unit have each appointed a person to represent them and the name of the Chairperson is known, the Minister”.

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-77, in Clause 12, be amended by replacing lines 32 to 37, on page 7, with the following:

“the need to establish good labour-management relations and to that end it shall promote terms and conditions of employment that take into account the experience and knowledge of employees and the economic viability and competitiveness of a coast-to-coast rail system.”

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 16.

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-77, in Clause 32, be amended by replacing lines 22 to 41, on page 14, with the following:

“(3) The employer and the union may agree on the appointment of a person as Chairperson, but where they do not agree on a Chairperson, the Minister shall, after obtaining the agreement of the official opposition parties in the House of Commons, appoint as Chairperson a person whom the Minister considers to be qualified, and the person so appointed shall be deemed to have been appointed by the employer or the union, as the case may be.

(4) After the employer and the union representing the bargaining unit have each appointed a person to represent them and the name of the Chairperson is known, the Minister”.

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-77, in Clause 34, be amended by replacing lines 25 to 30, on page 16, with the following:

“the need to establish good labour-management relations and to that end it shall promote terms and conditions of employment that take into account the experience and knowledge of employees and the economic viability and competitiveness of a coast-to-coast rail system.”

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 38.

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-77, in Clause 54, be amended by replacing lines 12 to 31, on page 23, with the following:

“(3) The employer and the union may agree on the appointment of a person as Chairperson, but where they do not agree on a Chairperson, the Minister shall, after obtaining the agreement of the official opposition in the House of Commons, appoint as Chairperson a person whom the Minister considers to be qualified, and the person so appointed shall be deemed to have been appointed by the employer or the union, as the case may be.

(4) After the employer and the union representing the bargaining unit have each appointed a person to represent them and the name of the Chairperson is known, the Minister.”

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-77, in Clause 56, be amended by replacing lines 11 to 16, on page 25, with the following:

“the need to establish good labour-management relations and to that end it shall promote terms and conditions of employment that take into account the experience and knowledge of employees and the economic viability and competitiveness of a coast-to-coast rail system.”

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 60.

(1255)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), a recorded division on Motion No. 4 stands deferred. This vote applies to Motions Nos. 18 and 32 as well.

The next question is on Motion No. 9. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred. This vote applies to Motions Nos. 23 and 37 as well.

Government Orders

(1300)

The question is now on Motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), a recorded division on the motion is deferred. The vote will apply to Motions Nos. 27 and 41 as well.

The question is now on Motions Nos. 14, 28 and 42.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ) moves:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 18.

Motion No. 28

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 40.

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-77 be amended by deleting Clause 62.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is now on Motion No. 14. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The vote will apply to Motions Nos. 28 and 42 as well.

[English]

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at report stage of the bill now before the House.

Call in the members.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 181)

YEAS

Members

Bachand	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard	Bélisle
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Deshaiies	Duceppe
Dumas	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Jacob
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Mercier	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Pomerleau	Rocheleau
St-Laurent	Tremblay (Rosemont)—40

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélaïr	Bélanger
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
DeVillers	Discepolo
Duhamel	English
Finestone	Flis
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Gouk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanrahan	Hickey
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knudson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley

Government Orders

Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Patry	Peters
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Skoke
Speaker	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stinson
Szabo	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wells
Whelan	Wood
Young —133	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Members	
Allmand	Asselin
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien	Cannis
Canuel	Culbert
Dalphoné-Guiral	Dupuy
Easter	Marchand
Payne	Peric
Picard (Drummond)	Ringuette—Maltais
Sauvageau	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

(1325)

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 1 negatived.

Therefore, I declare Motions Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, and 40 negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 4. The vote will apply to Motions Nos. 18 and 32 as well.

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would be so kind as to seek whether or not the House is prepared to give its unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on Motion No. 1 to Motion No. 4 which is now before the House?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The House has heard the suggestion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): We do not have unanimous consent.

[Translation]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 182)

YEAS

Members

Bachand	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard	Bélisle
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Deshaies	Duceppe
Dumas	Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Jacob
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Mercier	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Pomerleau	Rocheleau
St-Laurent	Tremblay (Rosemont)—40

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélanger
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
DeVillers	Discepola
Duhamel	English
Finestone	Flis
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Gouk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanrahan	Hickey
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague

Government Orders

Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Patty
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Ringma
Robillard
Rompkey
Serré
Sheridan
Speaker
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young —133

Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien
Pagtakhan
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Skoke
Speller
Steckle
Stinson
Telegdi
Tobin
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood

(1335)

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, if you were to seek it, you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on the previous motion to the motion now before the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 182]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 13 negatived.

I declare Motions Nos. 27 and 41 negatived.

[Translation]

The next vote is on Motion No. 14. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 28 and 42.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I think if you were to ask it, you would find there is unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on the previous motion to the motion now before this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 182.]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 14 lost.

[English]

I declare Motions Nos. 28 and 42 negatived.

[Translation]

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in at report stage.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Call in the members.

PAIRED MEMBERS

Members

Allmand
Bellemare
Brien
Canuel
Dalphoné-Guiral
Easter
Payne
Picard (Drummond)
Sauvageau

Asselin
Bernier (Gaspé)
Cannis
Culbert
Dupuy
Marchand
Peric
Ringuette-Maltais
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

(1330)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 4 negatived. Therefore, I declare Motions Nos. 18 and 32 also negatived.

The next division is on Motion No. 9. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 23 and 37.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I think if you were to seek it, you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on the preceding motion to the motion now before the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See List under Division No. 182.]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 9 negatived.

Therefore, I declare Motions Nos. 23 and 37 also negatived.

The next division is on Motion No. 13. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 27 and 41.

Government Orders

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I think you would find there is unanimous consent to dispense with the bells and to take the vote immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent to take the vote immediately?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 183)***YEAS**

Members

Alcock	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélanger
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
DeVillers	Discepola
Duhamel	English
Finestone	Flis
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Gouk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanrahan	Hickey
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Patry	Peters
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Skoke
Speaker	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stinson
Szabo	Telegdi
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wells
Whelan	Wood
Young —133	

NAYS

Members

Bachand	Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bouchard
Bélisle	Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Daviault	Debien
de Savoye	Deshaies
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godin
Guay	Guimond
Jacob	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Mercier
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rosemont)—39	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Members

Allmand	Asselin
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien	Cannis
Canuel	Culbert
Dalphoné-Guiral	Dupuy
Easter	Marchand
Payne	Peric
Picard (Drummond)	Ringette-Maltais
Sauvageau	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

(1340)

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare the motion carried.

When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): At the next sitting of the House?

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, millions of Canadians are waiting for this strike to end and for this bill to pass. I invite the opposition now to join us to see if we can pass the bill this afternoon. I ask for unanimous consent to proceed with third reading immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

[Translation]

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, in answer to remarks that were made I simply wanted to say that we have been making settlement offers since Monday and they have been turned down. The government decided that we would sit Saturday and Sunday and we will comply.

Government Orders

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in that case, I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It being 1.45 p.m., pursuant to an order made Thursday, March 23, 1995 the House stands adjourned until Sunday, March 26, 1995 at 1 p.m.

(The House adjourned at 1.45 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Saturday, March 25, 1995

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Maintenance of Railway Operations Act, 1995

Bill C-77—Allocation of Time

Mr. Gagliano	10981
Motion	10981
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 131; Nays, 41	10981

Maintenance of Railway Operations Act, 1995

Bill C-77. Report stage	10982
-------------------------	-------

Speaker's Ruling

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu)	10982
Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39 and 40	10982
Mrs. Lalonde	10982
Mrs. Robillard	10985
Mr. Gouk	10986
Mr. MacLaren	10987
Mr. Crête	10988
Mr. Manley	10990
Mr. Hoepfner	10991
Mr. Discepola	10992
Mr. Guimond	10993
Mr. Cauchon	10995
Mr. Ringma	10996
Mr. Keyes	10997
Mr. Dubé	10998
Mr. Boudria	10999
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge)	11001

Mr. Duhamel	11002
Mr. Mercier	11003
Mr. Milliken	11005
Mr. Laurin	11006
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	11007
Motions Nos. 4, 9, 13, 18, 23, 27, 32, 37 and 41	11007
Mrs. Lalonde	11007
Division on Motion No. 4 deferred	11008
Division on Motion No. 9 deferred	11008
Division on Motion No. 13 deferred	11009
Motions Nos. 14, 28 and 42	11009
Mrs. Lalonde	11009
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	11009
Motion No. 1 negatived on division: Yeas, 40; Nays, 133	11009
Motion No. 4 negatived on division: Yeas, 40; Nays, 133	11010
Motion No. 13 negatived.	11011
Motions Nos. 27 and 41 negatived.	11011
Motions Nos. 28 and 42 negatived.	11011
Mrs. Robillard	11011
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 133; Nays, 39	11012
Mr. Milliken	11013
Motion moved and agreed to.	11013