



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 104 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, May 12, 1998

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

All parliamentary publications are available on the
“Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire” at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, May 12, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.

[Text]

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1005)

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to two petitions.

* * *

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. Ivan Grose (Oshawa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 9th and 10th reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts respecting chapters 25 and 29 of the December 1997 report of the auditor general.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons the committee requests the government to table comprehensive responses to these reports.

* * *

CENTENNIAL FLAME RESEARCH AWARD

Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to subsection 7(1) of the Centennial Flame Research Award Act I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the 1996 recipient of the Centennial Flame Research Award.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 56 will be answered today.

Question No. 56—Mr. John Cummins:

With regard to the arrangement between the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the sport fishing lodges in 1995 to provide daily catch data to the department through the offices of the Sport Fishing Institute of British Columbia (SFI): (a) catch by anglers from sport fishing lodges accounted for approximately what part or portion of the total chinook sport catch; (b) what was the nature of this arrangement; (c) when was this arrangement negotiated; (d) When did the arrangement become operational; (e) why was it necessary (the Fisheries Act requires the lodges to provide the data to the DFO directly); (f) were there problems in the fishery in 1995 that made it important to have accurate catch data on a daily or weekly basis; (g) what were the nature of these problems; (h) what management actions were undertaken to deal with these problems; (i) in addressing any of the problems identified above did DFO fisheries scientists find the catch data provided through SFI to be accurate, timely and useful; (j) in addressing any of the problems identified above did DFO fisheries managers find the catch data provided through SFI accurate, timely and useful; (k) when was the catch data received through SFI from the Oak Bay Marine Group lodge *M.V. Marabell*; (l) was the catch data in (k) received in a form and at a time as required by the Fisheries Act; (m) was the catch data in (k) received in a form and at a time so as to allow the department to use it to effectively manage the fishery; (n) how did the data in (k) compare to what would have been received if it had been given on-the-grounds to the department as originally requested and as required by the Fisheries Act; (o) when was the catch data received through SFI from the Oak Bay Marine Group lodge King Salmon Resort; (p) was the catch data in (o) received in a form and at a time as required by the Fisheries Act; (q) was the catch data in (l) received in a form and at a time so as to allow the department to use it to effectively manage the fishery; (r) how did the data in (o) compare to what would have been received if it had been given on-the-grounds to the department as originally requested and as required by the Fisheries Act; (s) when catch data requests were made by Fishery Officers or agents of the department to the King Salmon Resort on July 29, August 2 and August 7, 1995, what was requested, for what time period, what information was eventually supplied, and when was the data required so as to meet the operational or management needs of the department; (t) when catch data requests were made by Fishery Officers or agents of the department to the *M.V. Marabell* on August 1 and August 6, 1995, what was requested, for what time period, what information was eventually supplied, and when was the data required so as to meet the operational or management needs of the department; (u) were any charges laid for the failure of the lodges to provide the catch data to the department on a timely basis by way of SFI and if not why not; (v) what were the names of the lodges who refused to provide the catch data directly to the department, and what were the names of the lodges who provided the catch data to the department via SFI in an accurate and timely basis and in a proper form; and (w) what effect did the lack of catch information from the sport fishing lodges have on local fishery managers and did it compromise their ability to ensure that target levels or caps were not exceeded?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): (a) Approximately 60% of the north coast sport catch is taken by lodge clients.

Routine Proceedings

(b) The arrangement made between the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, DFO, Queen Charlotte Island, QCI, lodge operators and the Sport Fishing Institute of British Columbia, SFI, was that the SFI would collect and collate catch information from the lodges on QCI and provide the information to DFO.

(c) August 1, 1995.

(d) On August 1, 1995 and the first report to DFO was August 8, 1995.

(e) Lodge operators were concerned about the confidentiality of weekly catch information from individual lodges and wanted only a summary to be released.

(f) Yes, a recreational catch ceiling had been imposed in statistical areas 1 and 2. Weekly information was required to track the catch.

(g) The catch ceiling was established to keep the north coast recreational harvest of west coast of Vancouver Island chinook at a level to achieve conservation goals.

(h) The recreational catch limit for chinook in statistical areas 1 and 2 was reduced from 2 per day and 4 possession to 1 per day and 2 possession on July 19, 1995.

(i/j) The catch data were provided as requested, and sufficient for both scientists and managers. The SFI was prompted on occasion to provide the data. Independent checks were done on the data provided and there was nothing to suggest the data were inaccurate.

(k) November 1995; the *M.V. Marabell* left QCI the second week of July, before the agreement with SFI.

(l) The information was not received during the summer of 1995 and was provided through SFI in November 1995 in a useable form.

(m) The catch data were not useful for in-season management.

(n) The catch data provided are considered accurate. The catch by guests of the *M.V. Marabell* form a very small portion of the total catch.

(o) The catch data for King Salmon Resort in Rivers Inlet were received directly from Oak Bay Marine Group in November 1995. The agreement with the SFI was to supply catch data from only QCI lodges.

(p) The information was not received during the summer of 1995 and was provided through SFI in November 1995 in a useable form.

(q) Catch data from Rivers Inlet lodges are not used for in-season management.

(r) The catch data would be the same.

(s) i) Information requested: Number, sex, size, weight, species, product form, and other particulars of fish caught, processed, or transported by King Salmon Resort-Rivers Inlet, its clients and employees; and the time, and place all fish were caught and retained and the person and vessel which caught and retained the fish. The August 7 request was for the lodge to comply with the August 2 request.

(ii) Time period: No specific time indicated as it was believed the information would be for the entire 1995 season.

(iii) Information provided: In the form as required of the charterboat sport fish log book program.

(iv) The information was to be provided during the season.

(t) (i) Information requested: Number, sex, size, weight, species, product form, and other particulars of fish caught, processed, or transported by *M.V. Marabell*, its clients and employees; and the time, and place all fish were caught and retained and the person and vessel which caught and retained the fish. The August 9 request was for the lodge to comply with the August 1 request.

(ii) Time period: No specific time indicated as it was believed the information would be for the 1995 season.

(iii) Information provided: In the form as required of the charterboat sport fish log book program.

(iv) The information was to be provided during the season.

(u) No charges were laid for failure of the lodges to provide catch data to DFO on a timely basis by way of the SFI because catch data were received on August 8, 1995

(v) All QCI lodges refused to give data directly to DFO and gave catch data to SFI.

(w) The lack of catch data on a timely basis from sport fish lodges had a small impact on the department's ability to manage the QCI sport fishery in season to within the established chinook catchcap. In the absence of this information fish managers anticipated catch levels based on previous data and other catch data. It did not compromise their ability to ensure the total catch was below the established ceiling.

[Translation]

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[English]

Mr. Mark Muike (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Question No. 21 has been on the Order Paper since October 3, 1997 and the parliamentary secretary has repeatedly promised the House that he will make inquiries. I am wondering if

those inquiries have been made and, if so, when we could expect an answer to Question No. 21.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I have noted the member's request. As he will have noted in the last two days we have begun to clear a considerable backlog and a number of the questions that have been asked have in fact been responded to.

I will undertake to look into Question No. 21 once again.

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I appreciate the answer to Question No. 56 this morning.

However, Question No. 33 was asked on October 28. I am still waiting for a response. It involves a special relationship between the minister of fisheries and the Oak Bay Marine Group and I can understand the reluctance of the minister to reply to that given the fact that the charges were dropped against the Oak Bay Marine Group.

I was wondering when I could expect an answer to that question.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, as the member has noted, he has received a reply to some of the questions and I was glad to be able to table those replies. I will look into any other questions he has as soon as possible.

The Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

BILL C-19—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That in relation to Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the bill and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill and, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

• (1010)

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: I am afraid it is too late for a point of order. The hon. member can raise his point of order when the members have come in, before the vote is taken.

• (1055)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 137)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Baker
Bakopanos	Beaumier
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bevilacqua	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepolo
Dromisky	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Lastewka	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Malhi	Maloney

Government Orders

Manley	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood —128

Turp	Vautour
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver) —105	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from May 8 consideration of Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 9 and 28.

• (1100)

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-19.

This debate has not been shut down. The proof that it has not been shut down is that a moment ago the opposition concluded that there was nothing further to say about the issue because it was not putting up more speakers.

The point I am getting to, as the House will easily recognize, is that we are not shutting the debate down. While I am speaking I am actually extending the debate and giving further opportunity for hon. members to participate.

I am sure the Chair has recognized this fully. We will be able to participate constructively, explaining all the good reasons why the amendments proposed by some hon. members in the opposition are unnecessary and superfluous in some cases. The bill as presented by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Labour, is the appropriate one.

Just so the House fully understands this bill and the amendments that are proposed, this bill actually made its way through the House of Commons in the last parliament. It then went on to the other place. Unfortunately the consideration of the bill was not completed at the time of the last election and because of that the bill must start back anew.

The bill was started again, was fully considered, went through second reading and then went to committee. In committee the bill was unfortunately stalled by the opposition. As a matter of fact, opposition members filibustered the bill and we had to obtain the good services of many members of the government who stayed in

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brison
Cadman	Casey
Casson	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Guimond
Hart	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoeppner	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Konrad	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lefebvre	Lill
Loubier	Lowther
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Manning
Marceau	Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McNally
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nunziata
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Power
Price	Ramsay
Reynolds	Riis
Ritz	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
St-Hilaire	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Government Orders

the committee hours and hours listening to speeches from members.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If I am not mistaken, I believe right now we are supposed to be debating Group No. 3 amendments at report stage of this very important bill, not talking about what happened in the last parliament.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is absolutely correct but I assumed the government House leader was trying to draw a parallel between what happened in the last parliament and this bill, which I assume he will do very promptly in order to avoid a repeat of this point of order.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I think I have just demonstrated how the opposition again is not listening. In fact, I was describing the events in committee two weeks ago on this bill. It was not in the last parliament but two weeks ago that his own colleagues were filibustering on this bill.

The strange thing about it is that the amendments which are deemed to be necessary by the opposition at this point were not even introduced in committee after all the debate.

Mr. Jean Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think if the hon. member wants to make a speech he should not have cut off debate. We should be debating this in the proper manner.

The Deputy Speaker: I am afraid that is not a point of order.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the hon. member is not too familiar with the bill, and that is okay. He is also not very familiar with the standing orders because he rose on a point of order which was not one. But that is okay.

The point I am making is that the government is fully interested in constructive debate. We are going to have two more full days of debate on this bill. We are going to be considering it at report stage today. We can remain on the same grouping, move on to the next grouping and so on all day, which we will gladly do. At the end of the day today we will be voting on all the amendments, then we will have a full day again at third reading stage. Finally, the bill will go to the other place where it will receive full consideration by the hon. members of the other place who are going to give it all the usual good work—

• (1105)

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been sitting here trying to understand what the government House leader is really talking about in Group No. 3 of the bill, which deals with successor rights and not what the Liberal government wanted to do or did do.

We on this side would like to debate the bill. If the government House leader has nothing further to say that is useful, maybe he should sit down.

The Deputy Speaker: I am sure the government House leader is making efforts to come to the point of the amendments before the House in Group No. 3, as all hon. members strive to do in their remarks on any bill.

The Chair is trying to be lenient to ensure that members are relevant in their remarks. I know we are looking forward to the government House leader's specific comments on these clauses.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I know there are only a couple of minutes left so I will attempt to summarize very briefly my comments on the bill and on the amendments. I recognize the amendments have to do with successor rights.

The point I was making to the House is that the opposition has consumed all this time and—

An hon. member: Get back to the amendments.

Hon. Don Boudria: That is what I am going to say right now if the hon. member will pay attention.

The opposition is pretending that we did not give this enough time for debate. There are two things wrong with that argument. One, the amendment in question that he is now describing was never put before the committee. It should have been put before the committee and there was lots of time for—

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This member is far away from debating Group No. 3. He is talking about the vote that was held 15 minutes ago. He is talking about time allocation. He should be talking about Group No. 3, specifically successor rights, which is what is of interest. We resent the fact that he, having invoked closure, prevents us from speaking to the—

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. members are raising points of order in respect of relevance. Sitting here for a large part of this debate I have heard a good deal of it.

We are on report stage amendments. Particularly after a time allocation motion has been put it is not uncommon to have a fair bit of discussion on time allocation. I am reluctant to rule that out of order. I did hear the House leader refer to successor rights earlier in his remarks and I know he has a great interest in the subject and in the bill. Obviously his interest is so profound he has chosen to speak on the bill, which he is now doing.

I hope hon. members would want to hear his remarks because I am sure that at some point they are going to be pithy in relation to Group No. 3 amendments.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by congratulating the Minister of Labour for the excellent work he has done in piloting the legislation.

Government Orders

I am sure I speak on behalf of all hon. members in also congratulating the parliamentary secretary who has done such a fantastic job of piloting the bill through the House and in committee in the face of the filibuster put up almost exclusively by the Reform Party, which does not want to see labour legislation advance in parliament.

We in the government and all Liberal MPs are very much interested in good labour legislation and it is unfortunate that the hon. members across do not share the enthusiasm that we in the government have demonstrated.

With that, I support everything that has been done by the Minister of Labour. I do not support the Reform amendments. After all, we are generally reasonable people around here and we cannot support the Reform amendments which have not even been subjected to the scrutiny of the committee. Reform MPs were only interested in filibustering. They did not even make the case in committee for what they are proposing now.

• (1110)

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The government has cut off time on this debate. I can understand why the government House leader would want to make an apology for the government, but can we not spend time on this bill? This is what—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry, but with great respect to hon. members there seem to be a lot of points of order that are really points for debate. The government House leader was addressing the amendments and indicating his opposition to the amendments. I think he was on topic.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will talk about successor rights as that is what we are debating today. It is unfortunate that we are now facing time allocation which means there will only be a few more speeches on this topic. Ten minutes of it just went down the drain due to some kind of diatribe from the House leader which I will not describe in further detail.

It is the 40th occasion the Liberal government has introduced time allocation to restrict people's ability to debate things. It is ironic that in our own rules of the House, Beauchesne's describes that is the job of opposition and it is within the realm of the tactics of opposition to talk at length on a bill it opposes. It is part of what an opposition party does in order to draw attention to the weakness of government legislation.

This is a weak bill although it depends on which you want to look at it. It is a very strong bill in that it is unbalanced. There is too much emphasis on cabinet rights and union rights and not enough emphasis on general worker rights, which may not necessarily be union, and the rights of parliament.

The successor rights clause is part of another one of these bills that give cabinet an awful lot of power to determine successor rights. This is almost exclusively in the area of airport prescreening security measures. There is a selection for us. The government of the day picks a particular occupation, not just transport but in this case airlines. Then it narrows it down further to just one part of the airline industry, the security industry. Then it narrows it down further to one part of security, airport prescreening. There is a special category in the bill that applies to those in airport prescreening and allows successor rights even when contracted out.

Although there may be a contract with an airport facility that involves prescreening security measures, this activity is the only one covered under this labour code that has the special provisions allocated to it. It does not talk about maintenance of airports, it does not talk about air traffic controllers, it does not talk about a lot of things. It talks about one thing. Who knows why that industry has been singled out as something that deserves successor rights. We do not think that part should be singled out. We think good labour practices apply equally to all people on both sides of the equation, workers and employers.

A good part of our airport facilities are contracted out.

• (1115)

That was a decision of the Liberal government. I fully supported it. Why they have decided that this thing should have successor rights nobody knows. I cannot understand why.

When people put in a bid for a job they should come in as bona fide employers in a jurisdiction and say they have experience, personnel and training. They may be unionized; they may not be unionized. That is a decision for the workers in the company to decide. They make a bid in all good faith for a particular service. They should be allowed to bid on an equal basis.

What happened in British Columbia? Perhaps I can use an example not just of successor rights but of when there is not balanced labour legislation. B.C. has an NDP government which is a lot like the Liberal government. It decides that only unions can apply for particular road building contracts on Vancouver Island.

A paid up, law abiding tax paying corporation of some sort with a long track record can be building roads to beat the band in British Columbia. It could bid on a highway project and say that it will fulfil not just this labour code because it is provincial but all labour code requirements and that its workers will decide what union they belong to or whether they belong to a union at all. They will decide what wages they work for because they have the power to withdraw their services as does every worker, and the corporation will be bid on the project accordingly.

The NDP Government of British Columbia said that they do not have that right. If it does not like the union, if they are part of the

Government Orders

Christian labour union movement, for example, it is too bad. It cannot bid on the project because they are not part of the unions the government likes.

The highway goes ahead. It is ironic that the biggest construction companies do not mind the law. It gives them a chance to bid against a smaller number of bidders. They are all in the same unions together, the biggest outfits, the ones with thousands of employees and hundreds of millions of dollars of work.

However, if a smaller outfit is just starting out or does not have a union that is affiliated, it is too bad. Tough toe nails; it does not get to bid. It does not even get to bid on the job.

Successor rights do a similar sort of thing. They say to employers or maybe to a co-operative that wants to bid on a project, whatever it might be, that cabinet will have the power to determine these successor rights and that is just the way it is.

In other words, they come in and say they want to bid on a project, that their workers want to work for it, want to belong to a particular union or do not want to belong to a union, or whatever it might be. Workers should have that right one way or the other. They should have the right to bid on the job.

It singles out a very small part of the industry. Unfortunately it says that part of the industry must have successor rights. Cabinet decides and that is the way it goes. If the job is worth \$15 an hour or \$12 an hour, it does not matter because once it is bid on it will pay the same as the last guy regardless. The workers will put up with it one way or the other, and that is just the way it goes. In other words, there is no choice. There is no balance.

We will hear a lot during the very limited amount of debate left about the necessity to have balance in labour legislation. This group of motions shows that there is no balance.

I would like to conclude by saying how unfortunate it is that again for the 40th time the government has brought in time allocation. There is no crisis looming. There is no work stoppage that has shut down the country. It is not like the economy has been brought to its knees. It is not like there is no current labour law in place.

They have decided for their own political reasons to bring in time allocation to stifle debate in a democratic institution. That is the only reason. There is no other crisis out there in the country. There is no other crisis in parliament. It is for one reason only. They have decided that they do not want to debate it any more.

That is too bad. Things like successor rights, final offer binding arbitration and the rights of workers to vote by secret ballot on their union certification deserve full debate in the House.

• (1120)

The government says too bad but it is tired of the debate. There is no crisis or no other issue. It is just tired of it and does not want to listen to the opposition. It just shuts it down.

This is the 40th time. Unfortunately members on the Liberal side seem to think it is all right to shut down democratic debate. Just so the folks at home know, they will push through the bill this week. There is nothing we can do to stop it. It does not matter whether or not we want to talk on it. Many members on this side of the House will be denied an opportunity to ever speak a word on the bill. That is undemocratic and very unfortunate. It shows a trend on the government side, the government that previously criticized Brian Mulroney's government.

Brian Mulroney's government on closure was a pillar of virtue compared to what the Liberal government has done since it came to power. It continuously uses this hammer. It is not a matter of negotiation. It is just too bad: "It is my way or the highway".

It is unfortunate the government has decided to go this way. It is a trend. It does not bode well for this institution that the government has decided this is the way to force through legislation, controversial or not. The government is just doing it.

I will be pleased to speak to further motions if I get a chance, which is unlikely given the time allocation.

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Oak Ridges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest and I would indicate as a member of the Standing Committee on Human Resources that the debate we are talking about today should have taken place in committee.

Unfortunately my friends on the other side were more interested in a filibuster and now have all the speakers. They did not have the speakers when we were in committee. To suggest for a moment that somehow the government is stifling debate is ludicrous.

In committee we started at 11 o'clock and went through to 8:30 because we had to go to question period. Again they were going through a filibuster. If the members on the other side wanted to talk about serious amendments, and I would suggest that these are serious amendments, they should have been discussed in committee.

I would like to put on the public record some issues I did not have a chance to do last week. The official opposition suggested that the certification procedures under Bill C-19 were undemocratic and that the bill deprived employees of their right to vote on union certification applications.

I do not agree with these statements particularly because there is nothing undemocratic about certification procedures under the Canada Labour Code. Bill C-19 does not amend these procedures.

The basis of certification would remain majority support. The board would retain its current authority to verify union support by

Government Orders

holding a certification vote in any case. Certification procedures under the code are similar to those in a number of provincial jurisdictions. I am sure those jurisdictions do not consider their procedures undemocratic.

We also heard a lot about the remedial certification procedure under Bill C-19. Members of the official opposition keep referring to the Ontario Labour Relations Board decision in the Wal-Mart case, a decision which members should be aware has been upheld by the courts, despite the fact that remedial certification procedures existed in five provincial jurisdictions for many years. The Ontario Wal-Mart case is the only case members of the official opposition can cite to support their position that the provision has been misused.

Contrary to statements made in the House last week, remedial certification in the Ontario statute was not brought in by the Rae government. It was there before the NDP formed the Government of Ontario. Interestingly the provision was modified but not removed when the current government reformed the province's labour laws.

Last week a member referred to the British Columbia Labour Relations Board decision in another Wal-Mart case. It is interesting that contrary to the member's assertion the B.C. board did not use its remedial certification powers to overturn a vote in that case. In fact the B.C. board ordered that a representation vote be held.

The absence of examples of use of remedial certification authority by provincial boards proves what the government has been saying about the provision. It is an effective deterrent to serious employer actions designed to prevent employees from exercising their fundamental right to organize.

• (1125)

It is rarely used and only to remedy the worst cases of employee conduct which make it impossible to measure employee support through the holding of a vote. The certification procedures and remedial certification provisions of Bill C-19 are part of the overall package of task force recommendations which representatives of both labour and management in the federally regulated sector accepted as fair and balanced. They should not be modified or removed from the package in my view.

Mr. Pat Martin: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to speak to the Group No. 3 motions, the recommended amendments to Bill C-19.

We do not find anything in these particular amendments that we feel will move the bill forward or make it better in any way, shape or form. In fact it certainly strikes us in the NDP caucus—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am just informed that the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre has already spoken to Group No. 3.

Mr. Pat Martin: Mr. Speaker, my understanding was that I spoke to Group No. 2. I frankly did not realize that I had spoken to Group No. 3. I could be wrong but—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I will double check. As hon. members know, each time a group comes forward each member has the opportunity to speak once to each group. It will just take us a second.

According to our records the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre spoke last Friday to this specific group. We could go back to *Hansard* and triple check, and we will do so.

Mr. Pat Martin: That will not be necessary.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Thank you. The hon. member for Waterloo—Wellington.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak regarding Bill C-19. I know that this is a complex bill, but having listened to the comments made by members of the opposition on the motions in Group No. 3 I can only conclude that the members do not understand the successive contractor provisions in Bill C-19. Either they do not understand or they are intentionally spreading misinformation.

They say they agree with part of proposed section 47.3 which would protect the pay levels of employees providing pre-board security screening services in the event of a change of contractor. Then they put forward Motion No. 28 which would remove the right of these employees to seek a remedy before the board if a successive contractor were in fact to reduce their wages.

In other words, the official opposition wants compliance with section 47.3 to be completely voluntary. If a successive contractor does not respect the provision, too bad for the employees. They would have no recourse and that is unacceptable.

Members of the official opposition have also talked at length about how the provision, if extended, could impact on railway short lines and the transfer of government services to the private sector.

This provision has nothing to do with either sales of business or the privatization of government services. It would not even apply to such situations and to suggest otherwise is completely false.

Proposed section 47.3 would not grant successor rights where the federal government or an employer subject to the Canada Labour Code contracts out services. Proposed section 47.3 would not even grant successor rights when there is a change of contractor. The successive contractor would not be bound by that collective agreement. The bargaining agent would not retain bargaining rights.

Government Orders

All the provision does is require a successive contractor to maintain wage levels, that is to compete on the basis of sufficiencies other than wage reductions.

This provision will protect low wage employees who might otherwise lose their employment or be forced to accept pay reductions when there is a change of contractor.

• (1130)

Pre-board security screening services are important to the safety of the Canadian public. Employees providing such services deserve this minimal protection as would other groups of vulnerable employees providing such key services. These are the kinds of employees who would benefit from protection under proposed section 47.3.

I thought it was important to set the record straight on these issues. I think it is important that we do so as a government.

I would also like to comment that I was at the committee when the Reform Party was filibustering. Talk about wasting time and resources. Talk about the abuse of parliament. Talk about being childish. All of this is from the party that claims there is a fresh start to be had in parliament and a new way of doing business. That is rubbish. I saw it firsthand and I was disgusted by it.

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I could not help but respond to some of the criticisms that were levelled from across the way.

The reason the Reform Party was filibustering in committee—

An hon. member: You admit it.

Mr. Rob Anders: Oh, indeed I do because filibustering is something that has been used by opposition parties since the beginning of parliament. It is one of the few tools that we actually have to be able to change government legislation.

As a result of the Reform filibuster, Bill C-19 was changed so that people who were offsite workers, contract workers would not be forced to have their names given over to union organizers. That way their home addresses would not be violated by union organizers along the lines of ding-dong, knock knock, the unions calling at their home addresses.

The opposition was able to get some amendments to Bill C-19 as a result of our filibuster in committee. However there are things that have not changed. Successor rights is indeed one of the things the government has not changed.

There are reasons we were enacting a filibuster and I am going to speak to this today. I would not have done so otherwise but I think it is important that people know why the opposition was doing that type of thing.

This is the way it works in this setting for the information of the folks at home. The opposition puts forward amendments, much like

we are doing today, substantive, real amendments like successor rights, but the government most often turns them down and does not give them fair and due consideration. If the amendments are put forward in cabinet or if they are put forward by members of the government, whether they be in committee or privately to cabinet members or however that process may work, they are more likely to be considered and implemented.

We were given good information that there were people on the government side who had problems with successor rights as they stand in Bill C-19 and there were people who had problems with privacy concerns and there were people who had problems with the violation of the secret ballot as proposed in Bill C-19, along with a few other things. We were giving those members time to bring those concerns forward in committee and they failed to do so. Those members who said they had a backbone in the government caucus and said they had a backbone in the cabinet failed to have one and failed to bring forward those changes to Bill C-19.

To the Minister of Labour who said that he did not have the resources in his own office to fight his own departmental officials on those aspects of Bill C-19 that he thought were over the top, shame on him. To the Minister of National Revenue who had concerns yet did not bring forward these things in committee and did not actually get a change when push came to shove, shame on him. Shame on them. To the Liberal caucus members who sat in HRD committee and argued along with the Reform Party on some of these substantive changes that we wanted early on when we were questioning witnesses in testimony, shame on them for not having put forward those amendments.

We wanted to see those things brought forward. We will be speaking about them today at report stage and we will be speaking about them at third reading. Shame on the government for not having brought those things forward. We know that is the only way those things would have been given proper and due consideration. The fact that the government put the 40th time allocation since it has been in office shows that government members have had little will or little backbone to stand up to the department.

Bill C-19 basically amounts to a departmental official being shuffled off for many years into a sideline of the labour department. Mike McDermott finally had his glowing chance and I talked with him many times in committee. To him I say, I guess you finally have your chance to leave your glowing mark on Canadian labour legislation by going ahead and embedding successor rights, going ahead and violating the secret ballots in workplace democracy, going ahead and not allowing final offer selection arbitration, but shoving through instead more cabinet power.

• (1135)

Rather than trying to achieve peace in the workplace, they are going ahead and giving the power more thumbs down control over the worksites which does not promote labour peace.

Government Orders

Mr. Reed Elley: Undemocratic.

Mr. Rob Anders: Very undemocratic.

With that, I subside. Those are the reasons why the opposition enacted filibuster. I am proud to say I was probably one of the biggest pains in the government's side in filibuster and am proud to have been so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The question is on Motion No. 9 in Group No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 9 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 28. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 28 stands deferred.

We will now proceed to debate on Group No. 4, Motion No. 10.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-19, in Clause 31, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 21 on page 23 with the following:

(3) The Minister may take only one action referred to in this section with respect to any particular dispute involving a bargaining unit and, in the case of one of the actions referred to in paragraphs (1)(a), (b) or (c), the Minister may take the action only with the consent of the parties."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased once again to take part in the debate on Bill C-19 through this logical amendment, which is consistent with the objectives of the new Canada Labour Code.

It is an amendment that might be described as ancillary, but which takes on its full meaning in the context of a labour dispute when the minister is called upon to use his authority to step in and appoint someone to resolve the dispute.

As members probably know, there are three courses open to the minister: he may appoint a conciliation officer, a conciliation commissioner, or a conciliation board. I will read an extract from this clause on page 23 of the bill:

(3) The Minister may only take one action referred to in this section with respect to any particular dispute involving a bargaining unit.

That would be to appoint a conciliation officer, a conciliation commissioner, or a conciliation board.

• (1140)

What we are adding, and to a certain extent this strengthens the intent of the legislation, is that such a decision may be taken by the minister only with the consent of the parties. If a labour dispute were dragging on and tensions were mounting, it would be a bit ridiculous for the minister to decide to step in arbitrarily, on his own initiative, and impose action that is supposed to resolve the dispute.

What we are saying is that the minister should have the consent of the parties to appoint a conciliation officer, a conciliation commissioner or a conciliation board, and that this should be done in a spirit of co-operation, without which such a decision on the part of the minister might well have the effect of worsening the situation, rather than resolving it.

It is only common sense that the government intervention provided for in the legislation should be desired by the parties. If it is not, it could have an effect opposite to that intended. If the parties are not forced to consent to one of the three mechanisms

Government Orders

available to them and thus perhaps reflect on how the situation is developing, things may get worse.

The Bloc Québécois is introducing this sensible amendment in the hope that the government and the other opposition parties will approve it, in order to improve the Canada Labour Code for the greater good of the public.

[*English*]

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this motion would entirely remove the Minister of Labour's discretion to appoint conciliation assistance unless the parties were to consent to such an appointment. Presumably it would require the joint consent of both labour and management before the minister could make an appointment under the code.

Government prescribed conciliation services have had a long and distinguished history reaching back to the very beginning of this century when in 1900 the Conciliation Act established the Department of Labour and provided for conciliation of labour disputes. Over the years the system has been modified. Currently the minister has full authority to appoint not just one but two consecutive levels of conciliation and that without the agreement of the party.

The presenter of the motion does understand that conciliation works best when the parties are committed to the process. What he perhaps does not understand is that sometimes in labour disputes a party will want to have conciliation assistance but will not want to ask for it for fear that such a request will be taken as a sign of weakness. That is where leaving discretion to the minister to appoint can be of great value.

During the extensive consultation process leading up to the introduction of Bill C-19, representatives of labour and management organizations subject to part I of the code, while critical of lengthy delays in the current conciliation process found conciliation valuable and praised the services offered by the federal mediation and conciliation service.

The labour-management working group did not recommend that compulsory conciliation be abolished, only that the two stage process be replaced by a single stage which could take various forms. This consensus is reflected in a single stage, time limited conciliation process included in Bill C-19.

The Sims task force found that conciliation remains an important function and that the federal mediation and conciliation service is a resource that helps reduce industrial conflict in Canada. Over 90% of disputes referred to conciliation are resolved with the assistance of conciliation officers without resort to work stoppages. The task force—

• (1145)

Mr. Reed Elley: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that there is not a quorum in the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We have quorum.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised. Reform Party members say they want to debate this bill and talk about the amendments and then the hon. member calls quorum and leaves the Chamber. He does not even stay to listen to the debate. It is really quite hypocritical.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sure that the hon. parliamentary secretary knows it is not proper to comment on the presence or absence of members in this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Wetaskiwin is quite correct.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain: Mr. Speaker, my apologies for pointing out that the member had left the Chamber when he called quorum.

The task force recommended that because of the nature of the federal jurisdiction and the prevalence of industries providing services to the public it is important that every effort be made and be seen to be made to find an avenue for settlement before the parties decide to resort to economic sanctions to further their bargaining objectives.

For this reason, the Minister of Labour requires the parties to take part in conciliation proceedings. Conciliation has proven successful in assisting the parties to arrive at settlements in the vast majority of cases and should remain an option for the Minister of Labour.

Elsewhere in the bill, of course, the conciliation process is being streamlined and modernized. I have already mentioned the two stages being compressed into one stage. The process is also being limited in duration unless the parties jointly agree to extend it. This should please the presenter of this motion.

Perhaps just as important is the new profile being given to the federal mediation and conciliation service. The service is well respected and the important role of the head of the FMCS in advising the Minister of Labour on dispute resolution will be formally recognized in the code.

Similarly, the service will gain statutory recognition for its work in fostering harmonious relations between labour and management. This will provide the platform from which to launch relationship building programs.

Government Orders

In all, Bill C-19 recognizes the value of conciliation and lays the foundation for its continuing development.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we again find ourselves, for I think the 40th time, looking at time allocation in the House. We believe this is a very important piece of legislation that should be debated. We have noted that in the past when the Liberals were in opposition they thought it was absolutely deplorable that the Tories would move time allocation as many times as they did. The Liberals wrote the book on time allocation.

I would like to refer members back to the beginning of the 36th Parliament. The first item on the Order Paper was Bill C-19. It languished on the Order Paper until sometime in November when it was given first reading. It remained on the Order Paper and just recently there was a big panic to put through the labour legislation which, I might add, was also an item of business in the 35th Parliament.

Suddenly there is a big panic to get this legislation passed, to the point where the government is only going to allow one further day of debate at report stage and one further day at third reading. I think this is an unprecedented abuse of the power of the government to lord it over the opposition. Our duty is to point out how we think we can improve this legislation and the government, I submit, is really hampering us in doing that.

• (1150)

To speak specifically to Group No. 4, the amendment put forth by my colleague from the Bloc indicates that the parties should agree on who the conciliator or the conciliation board should be at a point when the two parties cannot seem to agree on much of anything. This comes at a point when both labour and management have agreed to disagree basically on everything or negotiations would not have broken off.

I think that if the member's motion had read that both parties would submit names of conciliation officers that they would approve of and if each side happened to recommend a person whom each one agreed on then that would be fine. But to come up with a conciliator, an officer or a board, to make any sort of judgment on this is going to be extremely difficult.

If we are looking at people who are going to come in to assess the situation and render a decision, I think that input from the two groups would be a good idea. If they happen to agree on a person to arbitrate the case, that is fine.

I do not believe, though, that my colleague's amendment has a chance in the world of passing since at committee, on at least one occasion, members of the government made remarks that they certainly were not foolish enough to entertain or to pass any amendments put forth by the opposition. So I would caution my colleague that although his intentions are no doubt honourable and will, in his opinion, improve the legislation, he has about as much

chance of having this amendment passed as the proverbial snowball in Hades.

I should not prejudge the hon. member, but I think he may have overlooked one of the decisions the minister can make here. He may appoint a conciliation officer, a conciliation board or advise the parties of his intention to do neither. He may just say "No, I do not think it is appropriate for me to get involved at this time", and the parties would therefore be forced into a situation where they would have to go back and negotiate and get down to brass tacks rather than just throw their hands up and turn it over to someone else.

There has been a lot said in the House about whether this party or that party supports the collective bargaining process. Certainly the Reform Party does support the right to organize peacefully, to strike and to negotiate through a union.

However, I think the legislation, as I have said before in the House, is patterned after a report by Mr. Andrew Sims, and he named the report "Seeking a Balance". Certainly that is a noble goal for any labour legislation and indeed for most legislation, that it be balanced. Page after page of the report concerns the empowerment of the union organizers, the union bosses, and not necessarily the rank and file people who pay membership dues to the union, and certainly not the people who provide jobs for those union members.

• (1155)

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when we first saw the amendment with the idea of reviewing the role of the conciliation officer et cetera, we viewed it in a favourable light. Our caucus wrestled for quite some time as to whether we would support the amendment. At this time we are satisfied that the changes made to the original Bill C-19 will address some of the things we recognized as being problematic. Moving from a two stage process to a single stage process was a very positive step. Given the spirit and the history of how the amendments that form part of Bill C-19 were arrived at, we were very reluctant to upset that fine balance or compromise that went into the changes we see in Bill C-19.

I regret that our caucus will not be able to support Motion No. 10. We will be voting against it, but not for the same reasons we have been hearing from the official opposition. We are finding more and more that the tone of the official opposition's comments regarding this whole piece of legislation, no matter which group of motions we are talking to, has an underlying sinister quality to it. There is an anger and a bitterness surging forward in all Reformers' comments that reveals their true attitude toward the industrial relations climate in Canada. I do not think it has its basis in the same spirit of co-operation that was in the original Bill C-19. I am disappointed to that degree.

We saw some of the delay tactics that went on during committee stage and the filibustering that occurred during report stage. I wonder what prairie farmers think as they view these deliberate stalling tactics which hold back a very worthy piece of legislation. The agriculture industry in my province is looking forward to this legislation. We are coming up to another season when grain will be shipped through the west coast ports. The producers want the security that their products will be handled at those terminals no matter what kind of labour relations climate might exist at those terminals.

With its stalling tactics, at least until the closure motion of today, the Reform Party has jeopardized the possibility of moving this bill forward in a timely fashion, at least in time for the harvest season when grain shipping at west coast ports will be an issue again.

The tone of the rest of Reform's comments reminds me of another message I have heard for years. It is a poison that has been sliding across the Canada-U.S. border in recent years. That poison is called right to work legislation. This seems to be the songbook that Reformers are singing their hymns from. It is not original, but it seems they have glommed onto it as if it were a new idea. It is sort of like the way they have glommed onto final offer selection as if it is some brand new idea they have just come up with.

Everybody knows what right to work is about. The Fraser Institute has just written a book and sent a copy to all MPs in an effort to promote this idea as the way we should conduct ourselves in the 21st century within the labour relations climate. We have another book that shows the empirical evidence, the actual statistics, of what it is like to live in a right to work state. One of those states had lower than average incomes and the poverty level was higher. The right to work is really the right to work for less.

The Reform Party is using the debate on Bill C-19 as a platform from which to launch its ideas on right to work legislation. They were frustrated in Alberta. The Klein government looked at right to work legislation and found it was too radical and too conservative.

• (1200)

In fact, it was bordering on fascist in a lot of its attitudes and it actually dropped it. It did not want to use it, and to its credit. Now we are having people shopping it around Ottawa trying to get people interested from a federal point of view.

I think Canadians should be cautious about the spirit and the tone being used in these arguments. Read between the lines a little. What will really be seen is a warmed over version of right to work legislation trying to be foisted on the Canadian people through the back door, through debate on a very worthy piece of labour legislation, Bill C-19.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is the House ready for the question?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The question is on Motion No. 10. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): A recorded division on Motion No. 10 stands deferred.

We now turn to the motions in Group No. 5.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 19 on page 27 with the following:

“87.2 Unless the parties agree otherwise in writing,

(2) a notice shall not be required to be given by the trade union to the employer indicating the date on which a strike will occur; and

(b) a notice shall not be required to be given by the employer to the trade union indicating the date on which a lockout will occur.”

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 17 to 19 on page 27 with the following:

“seventy-two hours shall not be required to be given by the trade union or the employer if they wish to initiate a strike or lockout.”

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by deleting lines 20 to 38 on page 27 and lines 1 to 31 on page 28.

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 20 to 38 on page 27 with the following:

“87.3 (1) Unless a lockout not prohibited by this Part has occurred, a trade union may not declare or authorize a strike unless it has held a secret ballot vote among the employees in the unit and received the approval of the majority of the employees who voted.

Government Orders

(2) Unless a strike not prohibited by this Part has occurred, an employers' organization may not declare or cause a lockout unless it has held a secret ballot vote among the employers who are members of the organization and received the approval of the majority of the employers who voted."

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 6 on page 28.

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by deleting lines 7 to 31 on page 28.

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by deleting lines 23 to 27 on page 28.

• (1205)

He said: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues listened carefully and, fortunately, there is a consensus on the amendments that must be made to the Canada Labour Code.

We are interested in how, based on the labour code's provisions, a vote allowing workers to go on strike or employers to initiate a lockout would be held. We object to the procedure, and we wonder where the government got this strange idea.

We feel the government is unduly trying to control, to say the least, the union in terms of how it operates and in terms of its relations with its own members. Indeed, the government is proposing a slew of means and mechanisms that have the effect of controlling the union a little too much, and this is why we are proposing these amendments.

Motion No. 11 reflects our opposition to the 72 hour notice that is required under the bill, and that is supposed to be given by the union in case of a strike or by the employer in case of a lockout.

Through this amendment, we are causing it to be withdrawn because we think there is no need for notice to be given to either party. The party that decides to hold a strike or lockout should decide on the most appropriate time to do so without necessarily being required to give notice to the other side that it plans to act on its decision.

Also, regarding Motion No. 12, where the 72 hour strike or lockout notice is not acted on, section 87.2(3) provides that a new notice must be given.

If only for reasons of mere logic and consistency, we object to either party having to give a new notice where the strike or lockout initially planned did not occur. That is what Motion No. 12, which we feel will be passed by this House, is all about.

Motions Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 all concern the whole voting mechanism and the notices to be given. Once a vote has been held authorizing the union to initiate a strike, under the new

Canada Labour Code as amended by Bill C-19, a strike must be initiated within 60 days of the vote.

We consider this to be an arbitrary, unnecessary deadline, which, as Canadians—which we will probably remain for a short time—would say, could cause serious organizational problems given how huge this country is.

• (1210)

From coast to coast, from Newfoundland to British Columbia, unions could run into serious logistical problems if they had to hold a strike within 60 days of the strike vote. Let us say, for example, that an agreement has almost been reached, and the union has decided not to strike within the 60 days provided under the law. If an agreement is not reached, another strike vote has to be held. Given the breadth of this country, we are not sure that the government is making a wise choice in imposing such a time frame.

We consider that no time period should be provided, that, once the parties have the right to strike or to lockout they may do so when they consider it appropriate, without being overly restricted, as is the case here, by a time frame of 60 days following a strike or lockout vote.

The last motions, namely Motions Nos. 15, 16 and 17 set out the terms of voting, the conduct of a vote and the procedure for having a vote declared invalid. We have little sympathy for this sort of government intervention in voting activities and in technicalities.

It amounts to inappropriate intrusion in the operations of the union. I think they are going after the unions. There is also provision for an individual to invalidate a vote if they are not happy with it. Labour relations are complex enough as it is, and I see no need for the government to intervene in such matters. If there is one body in this country that is not in a moral position to interfere in the business of others and tell them how to behave it is the Government of Canada.

In terms of elections—of direct concern to it—the government is in no position to give anybody lessons on how to hold a vote. We all know that returning officers in this fine country are appointed on a purely partisan basis.

In Quebec we can count on our fingers the number of federal ridings where the returning officers have qualifications other than that of having worked for the Liberal Party of Canada. They come up with such inventions as postal votes, proxy votes, which are an open invitation to all unscrupulous organizers tempted to manipulate vote outcomes. This has been done shamelessly in some Quebec ridings.

Considering how lax the federal government is with respect to the Canada Elections Act, it is in a very poor position to lecture Canada's unions on how to carry out a vote, how to declare a vote invalid and all the procedures related to that.

Government Orders

It might be a good thing for the Canadian Liberal government to use its own bill as a model for inserting a bit more discipline into the Canada Elections Act, in order to clean up the mess we have got into in Quebec. Such practices as going after the senior vote by pursuing them to hospital rooms, waking patients up—it has gone as far as that à going door to door not to influence the vote, as our democracy is meant to work, but to get people out to vote. So they are far indeed from being in a position to lecture others, as they are in Bill C-19.

It is most unimpressive to see this government indicating non-confidence in the way unions have always operated. The federal government is most certainly not the one who should be giving lessons to anyone in this area.

I trust that these words have cast some light on this matter.

• (1215)

[*English*]

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this group of motions deals with the new requirement for exercising the right to strike or the right to lock out.

Under Bill C-19 the right to strike or lock out will be acquired 21 days after conciliation is completed, subject to the parties meeting new requirements regarding the holding of a secret ballot vote within the previous 60 days and the giving of a 72 hour advance notice of a strike or a lockout.

Motions Nos. 11 and 12 would delete the reference to the 72 hour notice requirement and the obligation to send a new notice if no strike or lockout occurs at the end of the notice period. The new 72 hour notice provision implements the recommendation of the Sims task force. Its purpose is twofold. It will allow for an orderly shutdown or reduction of operations and resolve the problem of perishable items. It will further focus the parties on serious negotiations and should encourage settlement of disputes.

To those unions which feel that this new requirement will frustrate the right to strike, it is important to point out that Bill C-19 will not require that a new notice be given once a strike or lockout action has commenced, even if it is temporarily suspended. Furthermore, where the other side begins a strike or a lockout action, the 72 hour notice requirement will not apply to the other party.

Some unions, mostly longshore unions, have said that the 72 hour notice requirement will allow an unfair advantage to the shipping companies and agents in the negotiating process as it will remove the prospect of ships being held captive during a port work stoppage. This position is echoed by the Bloc Quebecois.

The major economic impact of a port work stoppage is that the port is closed and the fixed capital remains idle. Surely such a major impact on important investments is a significant pressure point and a reasonable offset for the loss of income employees must incur during a work stoppage.

While the code recognizes a union's right to exercise economic pressure on the employer engaged in a labour dispute, and the strike is one of the economic sanctions that can be used, it is only reasonable that both parties have time to prepare for its use.

We believe that in the small number of cases under the code where the parties do resort to work stoppage action that the 72 hour notice requirement will ensure an orderly shutdown or reduction of operations. Who knows? There may even be a last successful effort at settlement.

The Bloc Quebecois has put forward five motions relating to the strike and lockout vote requirement. These include the removal of the requirement that the strike or lockout vote be held within the previous 60 days, the removal of the entire section 87.3 dealing with strike and lockout votes, the removal of the rules governing the conduct of the vote requirement, the removal of the procedure to contest irregularities, and the removal of the board's authority to summarily dismiss an unjustified challenge of votes and to order that a new vote be held.

It is important to stress that with the exception of the current Canada Labour Code secret ballot strike votes are mandatory in all Canadian jurisdictions including Quebec as a prerequisite for legal strike action.

Although the vast majority of unions subject to the code already hold secret ballot votes before declaring a strike, employees in the bargaining unit who are not union members may be excluded from participating in a major decision which directly affects them.

Strike votes are not always held in a timely fashion. In some cases a strike mandate is acquired early in the bargaining process as a means of demonstrating solid employee support for union demands but may not be a true reflection of support for a work stoppage.

The conditions for a valid vote specified in Bill C-19 reflect the recommendations of the Sims task force. They are similar to provisions found in a number of provincial statutes. They are not onerous.

• (1220)

It is hard to imagine that any democratically held vote would fail to meet these basic requirements. These conditions will simply ensure that such votes are timely, fairly conducted and based on the entire workplace involved in the dispute.

I have difficulty understanding why the Bloc Quebecois objects to a requirement for votes to be held in such a manner as to allow eligible workers a reasonable opportunity to participate in a vote

Government Orders

and to be made aware of the results. Surely this is fundamental to the democratic principles which trade unions recognize and practise.

The Bloc Québécois is also proposing that there be no opportunity for an employee in the bargaining unit to allege irregularities in the conduct of a strike vote. Surely there should be some recourse for employees who allege they have been unfairly denied the opportunity to participate in a strike vote.

Without such a provision the requirements of this section could not be enforced. Concerns have been raised that the 60 day period for holding a strike vote may cause difficulty in some cases, particularly where employees in the bargaining unit are employed across the country or do not work at a specific location. By allowing the 60 day validity period for a strike vote to be extended Bill C-19 addresses these concerns.

The 72 hour notice requirement and the strike and lockout vote provisions in Bill C-19 are fair and democratic. I urge members to support them and to reject the amendments proposed by these motions.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in Group No. 5 we see several motions put forth by the Bloc and unfortunately we can support none of them.

The requirement for a 72 hour notice before a work stoppage takes place is a reasonable one. The Bloc wants to delete this provision. We do not agree with that at all.

The 72 hour notice period is one of the few positive features of Bill C-19, at least one of the changes we could support. It would allow innocent third parties that have goods in transit, for instance, an opportunity to seek alternate arrangements. Or, if their goods were actually in transit, they would have an opportunity to carry on their journey prior to having the services withdrawn.

Many times we find perishable goods stranded somewhere and by the time labour and management have resolved their differences the perishable goods have spoiled. That is unfortunate and not fair to innocent third parties that ship these goods. Of course it has a very detrimental affect on Canada's economy overall.

The amendments put forth by my colleagues in the Bloc are not in concert with the idea of seeking a balance between labour and management. The people who use these services must be considered more because when services are withdrawn, whether through a strike or a lockout, it is not just management and labour that are affected. It is all the people who rely on the services in the area where federal industrial relations apply. Oftentimes these are services for which there is not an immediate alternative. In many cases this is the only game in town as far as the services are concerned. The provision for the 72 hour notice before a strike or lockout is a rather reasonable one and should not be amended as my colleague has suggested.

• (1225)

The 60 days as referred to in Motion No. 13 is reasonable and sufficient to negotiate and give the employers and employees time to prepare for possible work disruptions. As the parliamentary secretary alluded to several times in her statement, it allows for an orderly shutdown. It also allows time for people to make alternate plans. We concur with that. We think it is reasonable. We think it is an area that would not be improved by the amendment put forth by our colleague in the Bloc.

Motion No. 14 in particular seems to be a continuation of Motion No. 13. It would seem to deny worker and employee associations an opportunity to participate in a ballot vote. Our party is very much in support of a ballot vote being taken to determine whether there should be work stoppage or a strike. Also a ballot vote should be taken to determine whether or not a union should be certified.

In summing up, we will not be able to support these motions.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 11. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 11 stands deferred.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 13 stands deferred.

[*English*]

We will now proceed with putting the motions in Group No. 6 to the House.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing line 39 on page 28 with the following:

“of the public or the causing of severe economic hardship to the national economy.”

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended

(a) by replacing line 34 on page 29 with the following:

“danger to the safety or health of the public or cause severe economic hardship to the national economy, the”

(b) by replacing line 42 on page 29 with the following:

“or health of the public or the causing of severe economic hardship to the national economy;”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rochelleau: Mr. Speaker, unless I have misunderstood, we have voted on Motions No. 11 and Motion No. 12. What would be needed now is a vote on Motions Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17, which are part of Group No. 5, and not Motions Nos. 20 and 18.

• (1230)

The Deputy Speaker: The question was on these two motions only, because the decision that will apply to the other motions depends on the result of the divisions on the two motions I put before the House.

For example, if one of the two is rejected, there will be a recorded division on the others. Does that give the hon. member his explanation? Fine.

[*English*]

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 24 and 25 on page 31 with the following:

“let-go and loading of vessels and the move-”

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended, in the English version only, by replacing line 26 on page 31 with the following:

“ment of vessels in and out of a port”

He said: Mr. Speaker, Group No. 6 deals with the continuation of services where there is a situation in which the danger to public health or safety may exist and the minister would be able to step in and intervene.

That seems very reasonable. There are, however, no provisions in the bill that would allow for the continuation of service in order to protect Canada's economy. For instance, in the 1994 west coast work stoppage the estimated cost was in the range of \$125 million. That is the direct cost. That is what was estimated it would cost the Canadian farmers by not getting their crops to market. I suppose one could say they would eventually get their crops to market but if an item is not on the shelf, so to speak, it is extremely difficult to sell it. I think this is one occasion where a work stoppage had a devastating effect on the Canadian economy.

We are talking about the direct costs at the moment of roughly \$125 million. Indirectly the figures vary but it has been generally stated that the indirect costs could be as high as \$250 million and a possibility of threatening \$500 million in grain sales in the future.

Why do we say threatened grain sales in the future? If customers come to Canada for a load of grain and they find their ships have to wait in the port for a week or two weeks or three weeks and they have to go down to Seattle or Portland in order to get a load of grain, in the future they are going to say why take chances on going to Canada and not get the supply order they came for, that perhaps they should deal with the United States in the first place.

There should be some protection in the bill to protect the economy and to protect the innocent third parties who rely on these services. Services, as I have stated before, are not readily available. It is not as though we have a multiple choice as far as where we can ship our grain. Canada is not particularly well endowed with ports. The ports we have are certainly well appointed and capable of handling a tremendous amount of traffic but we do not have very many. When we have work stoppages at Canada's major port on the west coast it has an absolutely devastating effect on the economy of the country.

It would be in the interests of all Canadians if we have reliable access to services. Definitely it would help to keep employment within our borders and establish and maintain a reputation as a reliable worldwide supplier and exporter of goods. As I have said, we definitely have a world class transportation system and we should not allow it to fall whim to work stoppages, in particular work stoppages that occur at the highest traffic times of the year. We will hear people say if you are going negotiate, to take some kind of a job action, the best time to take it is when there is lots of activity because you want to put optimum pressure on whomever you are bargaining with to come to terms.

Government Orders

• (1235)

This bill does provide for maintenance of services whenever there is a danger to public health or safety. But I think the national economy is important enough that there should be some provision in here.

Throughout the bill we have seen the Canadian Industrial Relations Board, the replacement for the old Canada labour relations board, given all kinds of powers. Indeed we see where the minister and the governor in council have all kinds of powers they can use as well. We think it is only reasonable that they be given some latitude as to whether these work stoppages will have a devastating effect on Canada's economy and we have to look at the spin-off jobs damaged by the disruption in these services.

Motions Nos. 22 and 23 deal with amendments to the provision that ensures that grain once it reaches port will be shipped out. I would like to make it perfectly clear that the Reform Party is wholeheartedly in favour of farmers' grain being able to be shipped offshore unimpeded from the farm gate right to the high seas.

But this bill does not guarantee that. This bill does not address that. This bill simply says that if the grain reaches the port it will be loaded on to the ships and the ships will be piloted out of the harbour. It addresses the tie-up, loading and let go of grain vessels. We agree that is a good small step. But what does it do for the farmers on the prairies who cannot get their grain to the port because there is some kind of a work stoppage somewhere else in the system, between the farm gate and the port? This bill addresses no portion of that.

We are suggesting there should be some kind of dispute settlement mechanism in place that will allow services to continue in the west coast ports while negotiation takes place. We certainly agree that a negotiated settlement is far better and probably more long lasting than any kind of an imposed settlement. Regardless of what our opponents will try to convince us of, that is our position. We believe that to negotiate a settlement is the best way.

However, there are many other products, coal, sulphur, potash, dehydrated alfalfa, many petrochemical products as well, that depend on a deep water port to get their products to the markets, often to the Asian markets, and by sea is the only logical way to transport these products. The alfalfa dehydrators for instance export about \$100 million worth of product a year and their product is perishable as well.

• (1240)

What we are saying is put in a dispute settlement mechanism. If the government decides the Reform Party has given too much profile to final offer selection arbitration and brings it in, it would be accused of caving into the Reform Party. Then let it come up

with a dispute settlement mechanism of its own making, of its own naming, but something that would have the effect of the continuation of services at the west coast ports while we encourage those people to come to an agreement.

What has been the alternative over the years? The alternative has been to legislate services back to work at the west coast ports. Once that happens, there will be services reluctantly restored but there are none of the things addressed that brought about the work stoppage in the first place.

This government has used a dispute settlement mechanism over and over in the past in conjunction with back to work legislation. We are suggesting that a dispute settlement mechanism is needed here that would be far more effective than simply picking out one commodity and declaring it an essential service.

We certainly concur with the expedient movement of grain from the farm gate to the high seas. We recognize the provisions in this bill are a small step in that direction.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-19 introduces for the first time in the Canada Labour Code provisions that would require the maintenance of activities necessary to prevent immediate and serious danger to public health and safety during work stoppages.

The bill also introduces a requirement for employers and employees in the ports to continue to provide services to grain vessels loaded at licensed terminal and transfer elevators.

The official opposition has put forward motions to amend these provisions. One would make economic hardship to the national economy a criterion for requiring parties to maintain services during a work stoppage. The others would require the parties in the ports to continue to provide their services to all vessels and to authorize the board to refer collective bargaining disputes in the ports for settlement by final offer selection arbitration.

Together these amendments would effectively remove the strike and lockout rights from all parties in the ports as well as large numbers of other employers and employees subject to part one of the code.

Such an interventionist approach is contrary to the wishes of employers and unions who engage in collective bargaining under the code.

There is no precedent in Canada for the standing removal of strike and lockout rights from private sector parties as the official opposition is suggesting with respect to parties in the ports.

In addition, no Canadian jurisdiction includes economic impact as a criterion for maintaining services during work stoppages, nor did parties subject to the code support such an approach.

Government Orders

The Sims task force examined the issue of maintenance of activities and concluded that the right to strike or lockout should be removed from any group of workers or any employers subject to the code. The task force did recommend that the code include specific provisions for the protection of public health and safety, criteria supported by both labour and management.

The maintenance of activities provisions in Bill C-19 fairly balances the collective bargaining rights of employees and employers subject to the code with the public's right to protection of health and safety.

Turning now to the grain provision, grain has been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. It is a multibillion dollar industry exporting to over 70 countries worldwide. The livelihood of over 130,000 farmers and their families depends on Canada's maintaining its reputation as a reliable exporter.

These interests must, however, be balanced with the rights of labour and management to determine fair terms and conditions of employment through collective bargaining.

• (1245)

Since 1972 there have been 12 work stoppages in west coast ports which have disrupted grain exports. Nine of these work stoppages have involved longshoremen and their employers and were ended by parliament. Only three work stoppages have involved grain handlers and in one case the major terminal elevators in Vancouver were not affected.

Two independent studies found that longshore employers and unions have avoided their collective bargaining responsibilities by using disruptions to grain exports to trigger back to work legislation.

The grain provision in Bill C-19 is designed to reduce disruptions to grain exports caused by work stoppages in the ports, reduce the reliance of parties in the ports on parliamentary intervention in their disputes and maintain the strike and lockout rights of parties in both the port and grain handling sectors.

Claims that this provision discriminates against other resources by singling out grain for special treatment overlook the fact that grain has already been singled out by longshore employers and unions using it as a trigger for back to work legislation.

Claims that longshore unions will use the revenue earned by loading grain to finance longer work stoppages are without foundation. No more than 200 employees in a total west coast longshore workforce of well over 3,000 ever service grain vessels.

In the main port of Vancouver the percentage of longshore employees assigned to grain vessels is between 5% and 8%. After

tax earnings from this source would not sustain a lengthy work stoppage for the union which maintains no strike fund.

This provision has the full support of the grain industry and the grain producers who, unlike other resource producers, have no relationship or influence on collective bargaining between the longshore employers and unions. I also want to note that the government has committed to reviewing the effectiveness of this provision in 1999.

I think it is important that if one had been at the hearings and heard farmers speak about this clause and knew how much the western farmers need this clause it would be hard to understand why the Reform Party is trying to hold up this bill. It is hard for me to understand why it is holding the western farmers hostage in this particular issue.

I do urge members to support the provisions in Bill C-19 and reject the radical approaches being suggested by the official opposition which would conflict with Canada's International Labour Organization commitments.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased once again to participate in this debate, particularly as it regards these two motions put forward by the Reform Party. Many things can be said about that party, but it cannot be said to keep its cards close to its chest. It cannot be said to hide the contempt it has for the workers or at least for labour organizations.

Since things in this House are not always spelled out, it is worth reading these motions for the benefit of our listeners and for your benefit, Mr. Speaker, to see what they are all about.

The first little masterpiece is found on page 28. Motion No. 18 of the Reform Party concerns section 87.4, which deals essentially with the maintenance of certain activities, which we in Quebec refer to in more transparent terms as essential services, such as public safety and health, as the Canada Labour Code refers to. However, as you will see, the Reform Party has added a very cute line about public safety and health with respect to economic activities in this country.

87.4(1) During a strike or lockout not prohibited by this Part, the employer, the trade union and the employees in the bargaining unit must continue the supply of services, operation of facilities or production of goods to the extent necessary to prevent an immediate and serious danger to the safety or health of the public.

If ever the Reform Party came to power in Canada—poor Canada—this would be all the more reason for Quebecers to leave this country. And there are plenty of reasons. The Reform Party wants to add the following:

“of the public or the causing of severe economic hardship to the national economy”.

Government Orders

• (1250)

What this actually does is undermine the very existence of the right to strike and form a union because, ultimately, unions no longer have the right to strike, which is one of the things that make society fairer. Let us not kid ourselves; in the history of humanity, unions are a plus, not a minus.

Tactics as vicious as this, where a few little words completely undermine the real power, the equal footing at the heart of labour management negotiations, are a move—and a completely neo-Liberal one at that—to destroy the middle class.

The middle class benefits from the distribution of wealth and, through social programs and collective agreements, from the fact that wealth in this world is no longer concentrated in the hands of a tiny few but has been redistributed among several thousands of individuals. In the West, Europe, Scandinavia, North America, but unfortunately not many other places, there is a strong middle class that may also enjoy life.

That is what is at stake, make no mistake, if we approve such a motion, which adds a few words to ensure that strikes do not cause severe economic hardship to the national economy. They must not put anyone out. “Go ahead and strike, but we will make sure that no one is put out”. This is very hypocritical and cynical and members should be aware that it is part of an ideology that would see the gap between rich and poor grow as wide as possible and wealth increasingly concentrated in the hands of a tiny few, as it was before the industrial revolution and the appearance of unions in the western world.

The same holds for the other amendment, which is undoubtedly a recommendation of the Sims report. It refers directly to the problem already experienced by western Canada, where there is a special provision for grain vessels, and the fact that grain vessels and all related port activities must continue to operate, strike or no strike, and this provision is imposed on employers and unions. As I understood the witnesses, the wisdom of this provision is the envy of other sectors of activity.

But grain shipping is an activity based on a perishable product and that is what lawmakers, in their wisdom, wish to illustrate. It seems that the members of the Reform Party and the right, those with a one track mind, cannot contemplate such subtlety in society, that is, they cannot contemplate our making legislative provision for perishable goods known as grains, which determine the economic activity of an entire region of this great country Canada, where those who testified, the farmers, are economically vulnerable.

This is what the code is attempting to remedy and what we support, but what is opposed by the spokespeople of big business, that is the oil and mining companies, which complained that one

sector was getting special treatment while the necessary adjustments were not being made.

Very few people are aware of the fact, and I think the members all learned about it from a witness, whose name I have unfortunately forgotten, that this provision is contained in the Canadian Constitution, which would have to be amended in order to do away with this issue of grain crops and the special status accorded grains and wheat production in the west.

Therefore the wording of the code is warranted. The Reform Party, with Motion No. 22, is seeking to replace the words “grain vessels” with “let-go and loading of vessels and the move”. Thus they are broadening the scope of the bill by changing its content and giving everyone the same treatment. There would be no more special status.

• (1255)

The very particular matter of wheat’s perishable nature is trivialized in total disregard of the spirit of the legislation before us.

These are two motions that reflect the profound thinking of the Reform Party, which manipulates words a bit too much, by the way. The word “reform” is being hackneyed. That is somewhat unfortunate of itself. We would hope the House will reject as vigorously as possible this sort of amendment, which is too much like a school of thought—which, we hope, will soon disappear—that of the impoverishment of the poor and the enrichment of the rich, concentration rather than distribution of wealth.

It is unfortunate that we have in this House the sort of lawyers that have become the apostles of this battle, which leads nowhere, that they are questioning the gains made by humanity at great cost, resulting in a respectable middle class in certain countries. This cannot be permitted, and we will fight it with our last breath.

[English]

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak to the motions in Group No. 6 of Bill C-19. I am sure my hardworking colleague from the official opposition, the critic for the labour file and the member for Wetaskiwin, recognizes this is a very important bill and a very positive step in amending the Canada Labour Code.

I am sure most of my colleagues in this House remember sitting in this House on a Saturday and a Sunday in 1994 in support of our western grain producers.

The official opposition has proposed a change to section 87.7 from a limited requirement for parties in the ports to continue services to grain vessels to a complete ban on strikes and lockouts in the ports.

Section 87.7 addresses a specific problem identified by two independent studies. That is, parties in the west coast ports have

Government Orders

been using disruptions to grain exports as a trigger for parliamentary intervention in their disputes. Removing this trigger without removing the strike and lockout rights of the parties will force them to accept their responsibilities and develop their own solutions to collective bargaining issues.

Opponents of this provision claim it discriminates against other resources. However when questioned before the standing committee, they admitted that it is in their interest to retain grain as a trigger for parliamentary intervention. They know that as long as grain exports are disrupted, parliament will be quickly pressured into intervening in a work stoppage. They want to be able to continue to use the 130,000 western grain farm families as pawns in someone else's labour dispute.

Section 87.7 has the strong support of western grain producers and the grain industry. These groups pointed out to the committee that the grain industry is unique not only because it is food and because the world continues to exist on an 18 to 21 day grain supply, but also because of the political nature of production, transportation and marketing. It is this uniqueness of grain that has been detrimental to the labour peace at the west coast ports during contract negotiations. In their view section 87.7 will help bring grain back to a more level playing field.

The government is of the view, as was the Sims task force, that without the ability to interrupt grain exports, the parties in the ports will be forced to accept their responsibilities and to settle their disputes without lengthy work stoppages. Those who oppose the provision claim and some even threaten that the provision will not work. It can work. The parties have the ability to negotiate with each other and conclude agreements which are good for them and for the health of the ports. They should concentrate on solving their own problems.

If Canadian ports are to remain competitive, the parties must work together to find workable solutions to collective bargaining issues. Remove strike and lockout rights and you remove the incentive for the parties to deal with issues important to the future of the industry.

• (1300)

That is what Motions Nos. 22 and 23 would do. I urge all members to reject them.

Our government will continue to support our western grain producers. Bill C-4 gives our producers continuous support and the freedom to decide their own future. This bill will support these very valuable producers.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was not going to rise to speak to this group of motions, but because of what I am hearing from the two sides I would like to comment on Motion No. 18 in Group 6. As I understand this motion, a strike

would not be allowed or would be ended if economic hardship could be demonstrated.

I question how anybody could be that painfully naive about labour relations to put forward a motion that would call for a strike to cease if there was economic hardship demonstrated. What is the purpose of withholding services if not to peacefully apply some kind of economic pressure on the other party? That is the very nature of withholding services, to try to motivate somebody to your way of thinking. There is a level of naivety there. I hope it is naivety and not just plain ignorance.

We are speaking against the idea that this motion should even be entertained. Anybody who has some labour relations background in this House would see through that immediately and would not give it the time of day.

The people who are putting this package forward should remember that Bill C-19 was born out of a truly co-operative consultative process which was almost an experiment. It was almost a pilot project on how to amend labour legislation. Labour and management worked together for more than two years to try to find the balance they were seeking, the balance recommended by the Sims task force. They have done an admirable job. Many of the motions we are dealing with today would tend to upset that delicate balance and would jeopardize the success of the whole process.

There are other tripartite models of labour, management and government working together around the world. Those countries are moving forward as nations and are doing a good job of elevating the standards of the living conditions of the people they represent. Those countries have realized that it has to be a tripartite model. The hostility and the adversarial qualities that we sense from the tone of some of the Reform Party motions will only hold us back as a nation. There is no future in that kind of thing, with one party determined to stamp out the other. Instead the more civilized model is the three parties working together and moving forward.

What we are hearing from the Reform Party, in many of the motions it is putting forward, is a reworked version of the right to work movement. Do we want to go in that direction? We should be cautious. We should look at those places where right to work is a reality before we take that particular road.

North Carolina is a right to work state. Everybody has heard of the Triangle Shirtwaist Company fire in 1913 that founded the whole idea that workplace safety and health is an issue. The whole world agreed that it was too horrible to ever let it happen again. I have news for members. In the right to work state of North Carolina, 20 women died recently in a fire in a chicken processing plant because they chained the doors closed from the outside. They were convinced that these low-waged women were stealing by-products from the chickens, like wing tips, to make soup when they got home.

Government Orders

From 1913 to 1995 we have come the whole circle. With that kind of environment, where there is no worker representation on joint labour-management safety committees, standards quickly erode if we are not diligent about trying to elevate the standards and working conditions. Right to work is a step in the wrong direction in that regard.

• (1305)

Some of the other motions deal with the movement of grain through the west coast ports. This is key and integral to the whole balance I was talking about in Bill C-19. The whole process of Bill C-19 was a trade-off, where none of the parties really came away very satisfied that they got everything they wanted.

We would have liked to have seen a lot tougher anti-scab legislation. Nobody likes to give away the right to strike, the right to peacefully withhold services, and in this case they have not, but in actual fact the grain will keep carrying through.

The positive side of this, the upside and the side that seems to be lost on the Reform Party, is that there are about 130,000 Canadian farmers who are anxiously awaiting the speedy passage of this legislation so they can feel secure that their crops this year will not be interrupted by any kind of a dispute at the west coast ports.

Talk to pool elevator operators, the UGG or the whole agribusiness. They want this bill to go through, and yet we have the Reform Party, largely made up of representatives from western agricultural districts, being an obstacle and a barrier to this very real benefit to the whole prairie agricultural industry. It is a real contradiction. I hope Reform members are thinking this through. As they stand to speak they should be aware that the industry is watching these debates very carefully. I am sure they are scratching their heads wondering right now how they can see fit to justify being a barrier to the speedy passage of this particular bill.

We know that the favourite right-wing think tank of the Reform Party is the Fraser Institute. The Fraser Institute, that tax deductible, right-wing melting pot for all their ideas, is pushing the idea of right to work. Donated copies of the book promoting right to work as the answer for labour relations in the 21st century have arrived in our mailboxes. They are trying to imply that Canada is backwards because we believe in a more progressive labour relations climate.

The Fraser Institute and the Reform Party are going down a dangerous road as they advocate this particular labour relations environment. It is the role of labour and the role of governments to provide the legislative environment in which unions can do their job to elevate the standards of wages and working conditions for the people they represent. It is a matter of the redistribution of wealth. It is a matter of spreading the wealth of this great nation

among the working people. Anything that we do to hold that back does not move us forward in any way at all. It is a myth.

The fact is that fair wages benefit the whole community. I do not see what it is about that concept that bothers the Reform Party, but it seems bound and determined to reduce the ability of unions to do their job in elevating the standards of the community. Holding us back in that regard does not help anybody.

It is middle-class people with money in their pockets who can go out, purchase things and get the economy moving. Screwing them down in terms of wages does not benefit anybody. That is the empirical evidence. The statistics of all the right to work states in the United States, the 21 right to work states, show that some of them have no minimum wage. All of them have a lower than average industrial wage. They have worse health and safety legislation. They even have a higher infant mortality rate and all the predictable things one would see in the low-income category.

We believe in our caucus that society does not move forward unless we all move forward together. The motions that are being put forward by the Reform Party are completely the opposite of that point of view.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, before I begin my speech I have to make a comment on some of the last things that have been said and some of the previous speeches just before me.

I cannot believe what I am hearing. The member who has just spoken, as others, talked in a very rational, calm tone, saying things that are totally false and we cannot leave those things unchallenged in this House.

He referred to us as being naive and not thinking through things. I would challenge him to think through some of these things himself.

• (1310)

They talk about defending workers, that this is their mandate and so on. Some of the amendments that we have put forward would in fact protect workers better. They would help protect the economy. When we are protecting the economy we are doing what is best for workers. The NDP ought to think that through.

Who suffers most when we destroy the economy in certain areas? Of course it is the worker. What the NDP does not realize is that innocent third parties are being hurt and hurt severely by what is happening at the ports.

The member who just spoke said that we do not represent farmers and have not talked to them. I have talked to farmers and I have spent a lot of time with them. They have talked to me about this legislation. That is why we have proposed some of these amendments. For example, we have an amendment here that would include other commodities that farmers produce in this legislation.

Government Orders

The members display their lack of knowledge of the farm economy. Farmers do not just grow seeds and grains. They produce other things that, when shipped, look almost like seeds but will not be treated the same in this bill. For example, they produce alfalfa pellets which are simply dry little pellets that are made from alfalfa grass. Why should that be treated any differently than wheat, barley or canola?

The members have not addressed this. They have read these prepared speeches from the bureaucrats without realizing that they do not address the problem that we have come to address.

We are speaking on behalf of farmers. Why should we divide the agricultural community as this legislation does? It is totally unfair.

Another thing that the government keeps saying over and over is that Reform is holding up the bill. Look at the reason we are pushing for these changes. It is the lack of democracy in this House that forces us to try to get the attention of the government as to the importance of these amendments. It just does not listen.

This bill has a good aim. There are some very good things in it. But if it can be strengthened, why not strengthen it? It makes no sense to simply pass this bill through the House and not consider some of the very reasoned and good amendments that we have put forward.

I challenge the government not to just listen to us. I challenge the NDP. I challenge the Bloc. Do not just listen to what we are saying. I believe if they talk to Canadians generally they will find that we have very strong support across the entire spectrum for these amendments. I challenge the government to find out the same thing that we have found out, which is, this is what people want. We need to return to a real balance in labour legislation.

I would like now to begin my speech. That was simply in reply to some of the things that were said previously which are totally unfair.

The whole debate today was led off by the House leader for the Liberal Party. I would like to read a quotation. "I am shocked. This is terrible. This time we are talking about a major piece of legislation. Shame on those Tories across the way". Do you know who said that, Mr. Speaker? It was the very person who introduced the motion to invoke time allocation upon this bill. It was the government House leader.

I will read another quotation. "It displays the utter disdain with which this government treats the Canadian people". That was said by the foreign affairs minister when he sat on this side of the House in opposition.

Here is another quotation. "This is not the way to run parliament. This is abuse of the process in this House". I will not tell you, Mr. Speaker, who said it, but it was a highly esteemed

member of the government. I do not want to embarrass anybody in this House at the present time.

An hon. member: We want to hear it.

An hon. member: Please.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Maybe at a later time, but not at this time. I respect the Chair.

Grain is given a preferential treatment. We are asking for equality. In my riding alfalfa producers are really protesting this inequity. I hope the government will reconsider and allow its members at least a free vote on this. If there is going to be any reform or any freeing up of this parliament the government has to lead in reforming and democratizing the House. We are only one small voice in this regard.

• (1315)

One of the things that has been said is that we should not be singling out just grain. There are many other commodities that deserve equal protection. We need to protect the national economy. We have already made that point.

The grain producers and many other commodity shippers have been held hostage by the labour disputes at the west coast. Third parties that have no control are greatly harmed.

We have had a discussion in the House in the last couple of weeks on hepatitis C and the victims who have been harmed. Third parties were harmed and they had no control over the circumstances. This is not in the same category but here is a third party being harmed by a situation over which it has no control, that being strikes at our ports. It is blatantly unfair to allow that to continue. I hear the NDP, the Liberals and the Bloc defending this but it is basically most unfair.

If there is a better solution such as final offer selection arbitration why not consider that? It has worked and it has worked very effectively. It would prevent some of the great harm that is being done to the third parties that suffer because of the strikes that take place. It would be protection for the economy. There is a balance here. It is not just the strike but also the lockouts so it helps both sides.

It is in the interest of all Canadians that we have reliable access to essential services. If we do not what is going to happen? We are going to lose some of the jobs to our competitors such as the United States. We would like to keep employment within our borders. We need to establish and maintain what we now have and that is a reputable world class export system. We need to continue to maintain that.

Canada has had this transportation and communications infrastructure and many of these things will gradually have to be scaled back if we allow these strikes and lockouts to continue. The

Government Orders

disruption in day to day operations of vital transportation sectors would inhibit the national economy from functioning.

The second group of motions that we would ask the government to support also deals with proposing an extension to include all the other commodities. I have mentioned one which I am very familiar with and that is alfalfa pellets and alfalfa products. There is no reason why that cannot be included in this.

I do not know if members realize that the port of Vancouver alone in 1960—I think that is the right date—had \$30 billion in exports. Only \$4 billion of that is grain. The government is dividing up and giving special treatment to a certain sector and we have no problem. We appreciate the fact that grain producers will have this protection but it should be extended to all. That is why we cannot accept what the government has done and so have proposed the amendments. Grain is only about 20% of the commodities that are shipped to the west coast.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on Bill C-19 which seeks to amend the Canada Labour Code.

I listen to debate from across the floor and from members from the other party accusing the Reform of being anti-worker, holding farmers hostage and trying to make the middle class rich. I ask myself what is the debate leading to.

• (1320)

Labour harmony is very crucial to the economic prosperity of Canada. That goes for the workers, the employers and management. Economic prosperity is a partnership between the workers, management and those who run the businesses. Any time we create an imbalance going toward one right against the other then we are creating a situation where in the long run it affects all Canadians.

When my hon. colleague talks about the Reform Party spending time working for the middle class, I would like to tell him that the majority of the middle class are workers for whom he is saying he is fighting for their rights. I do not know whose rights he is fighting for but he seems to write off the middle class. I would like to remind the member that it is the middle class people who are also the workers of this nation.

As my colleague said, we are trying to create a fair balance, a balance in the rights of the workers and the rights of the persons who have put the time, effort and sweat into running the business. We cannot have one held hostage at the expense of the other. Both are partners in the economic prosperity.

The Reform Party in general supports many of the good intentions in this bill. Like my colleague said, all we are trying to do is strengthen the bill. We are not taking anybody's right away despite the rhetoric that comes from the other side.

My colleague quoted what members on the other side said when they were on this side. As a new member of parliament it makes me agree with Canadians who say politicians do not speak the truth. These are the members who said one thing on closures while on this side of the House and another thing on closures on the other side. This is not a good example for upcoming politicians in this country.

The Reform Party has brought in Motions Nos. 18 and 20 which deal with the national economy as a whole. The federal government has approximately 10% of the workforce under its jurisdiction. That 10% is working in an environment providing service to all Canadians which is very important and crucial. In some of the legislation it gives them a monopoly. Therefore these industries have a very serious potential of harming all Canadians.

When we look at this bill in terms of these motions that is what we are talking about. It is wrong to say we are trying to hold workers hostage. We are just trying to say that we should not hold Canadians hostage. As such, my colleagues have brought in amendments that are trying to address that.

We agree that the continuation of service must carry on if there is a danger to public health and safety. That is paramount and critically important. However, we also feel that the national economy needs to be protected but not by taking away the rights of the workers as was said on the other side. We want to create a balance to ensure that services go on and we do not hold the Canadian public hostage. Being a member of the union as well as working in the business sector, I feel everything needs to have a balance. I have had experience both in strikes and running a business. I can see that antagonistic attitudes, egos and all these things get in the way and create a situation that harms the Canadian public.

• (1325)

Motions Nos. 22 and 23 deal with the transportation of grain. Once the grain reaches the port it can be shipped out. There are flaws in this and it is absolutely ludicrous for anyone to say that we are holding farmers hostage. We are not. This is absolute rubbish.

What we and the farmers are saying is that their crops are very important. Grain must be shipped but so should the other crops. This is crucially important for our economy.

We cannot carry on. It is quite interesting, as my colleague across the way indicated, that grain is crucially important for the economy. Grain is crucially important for Canada's international commitments. I agree 100% that it is crucial but why are they speaking about only one aspect? There are all the other aspects which make up the whole picture. Members across can pick up on things that suit them and present their arguments. This does not give the whole picture.

Government Orders

If we think it is critically important for the nation and need to address it in a bill then let us address the whole issue, let us address the whole picture. All farmers are equally important. They have international commitments. They have international obligations to meet.

We support the grain farmers and we think the intent of that small portion is fine but we are asking that they all be included to give a whole picture.

I feel that in supporting these amendments I am not going against the wishes of workers. I am not being anti-worker. All I am saying is let us look at the whole picture. Both workers and management have an equal role to play and both are partners. Therefore this should not be viewed as anti-worker legislation but something to make the whole picture.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among all parties and with the member for Kamloops concerning the taking of the division on Motion M-75.

I believe you would find consent for the following motion:

[*English*]

That at the conclusion of today's debate on M-75, all questions necessary to dispose of the said motion shall be deemed put, a recorded division deemed requested and deferred until Tuesday, May 26, 1998 at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

● (1330)

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 18, 20, 22 and 23.

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address issues relating to Bill C-19 and the Canada Labour Code. I want to bring to the attention of the House my concerns both as to what the government has failed to include in the bill as well as the problems with proposed amendments to the labour code.

Let me first address an incident where the Canada Labour Code failed to protect the health and safety of a federal government

employee and ought to be strengthened. While the focus of Bill C-19 is on collective bargaining, the labour code itself deals with the health and safety of federal government employees.

Canadians have a right to expect their government to be a model employer that takes great care to see that its employees are not unnecessarily put in life threatening situations. Yet the facts suggest that the government has often been careless with the lives of its employees. The labour code is the first line of defence of an employee of the federal government yet it often fails them. Let me give a specific example.

Dean Miller was a fisheries officer in Prince Rupert. He was required to take white water survival training in the Kitimat River on September 18, 1996. Dean died of a heart attack that day. He was forced to take a course that he probably did not need and definitely should not have been asked to participate in. Dean was a supervisor who worked in an office in Prince Rupert. There was no obvious reason for him to be ordered to take a rigorous white water survival course; his job never required it. Dean had a pacemaker and a serious heart condition. He never should have been forced to take such a course.

The law requires that federal employees taking rigorous and demanding survival courses first be approved as medically fit by the Department of Health. Dean was never approved as medically fit by the regional medical officer of the Department of Health. More than likely if such a medical test had been done, Dean would have been excluded from that course. Perhaps he would have been alive today. He certainly would not have died in the Kitimat River.

The minimal requirements of the labour code were never enforced. Dean had not neglected his health or his wife and family. He had a check-up only months before his death. The medical report from that check-up stated: "His fatigue has continued. In fact over the last four to five years it may be worse. He finds that when he exercises he gets tired with some breathlessness". Nevertheless Dean took the course because he believed it would protect his job and thus his family.

After Dean's death the department of human resources stepped in and shut down the mandatory white water survival course under authority of section 145 of part II of the code. A directive was issued to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans that stated:

On September 18, 1996 the undersigned safety officer conducted an investigation into the fatality of Dean Miller on the Kitimat River, a workplace operated by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans—being an employer subject to the Canada Labour Code.

The said safety officer considers that a condition exists that constitutes a danger to an employee while at work.

Employees are participating in a swift water rescue—course without a risk evaluation having been conducted or physical fitness ability (medical condition) of employees having been conducted contrary to section 124 [of the code].

Government Orders

It is now clear that DFO had been failing to follow the requirements of the Canada Labour Code for years. No real action has been taken against those who required Dean Miller to take this rigorous survival course even though he had a pacemaker and a serious heart condition. Dean died while on the mandatory course.

Thankfully a safety officer acting under the Canada Labour Code shut down the program, but only after Dean died. No action was ever taken against the DFO officials who ordered Dean to take the safety course. The only person who has suffered was the DFO safety officer. He was concerned by the lax attitude to employee safety in his own department. He was forced out of the department for speaking out on the death of Dean Miller.

I brought Dean's death to the attention of the minister of human resources on April 25, 1997. I asked that a review of the procedures be undertaken that required a fisheries officer with a very serious pre-existing medical condition to take a white water survival course and for a copy of such a review when it was completed. I have never received a satisfactory reply. I ask again today for a reply from the minister on the death of Dean Miller.

Let me now turn to the amendments to the code contained in Bill C-19. Section 87.7 has been of concern to employers in British Columbia. It is said that section 87.7 has a laudable objective: to keep prairie grain moving to the markets. I think we all agree with that point.

• (1335)

I suspect the real intention of the bill though is to make life easier for the Minister of Labour and his staff. They claim it is too much bother to deal with disputes that tie up the shipment of grain. If the shipment of grain is too difficult for the minister, then let him step aside.

B.C. industry believes that section 87.7 is a mistake. It points out that Mr. Justice Estey has been asked to report to the government on grain transportation and handling. It suggests that it is premature to take this action prior to the Estey commission even having completed its report.

Industry in my province believes that section 87.7 may lengthen labour disputes. It believes that striking employees may have less incentive to bargain.

The B.C. economy depends on trade. Forest products and coal are no less important to the B.C. economy than grain is to the prairies. If this provision has the effect of prolonging industrial disputes in British Columbia, then it is a mistake. If it makes our ports less competitive with their American counterparts, it is a mistake.

There are two ports in Delta—South Richmond, the Delta port at Roberts Bank and the Fraser port facility. I have yet to hear from

any user of either that section 87.7 will advance the ports in Delta—South Richmond.

It has been said that the grain provision is counterproductive and fundamentally at cross purposes with the government's widely supported efforts on the international trade file.

It is unreasonable and unacceptable that prairie grain shipments will have access to British Columbia ports during a strike, while B.C. based exports will not.

Industry leaders have outlined a number of negative consequences and equity considerations raised by section 87.7. They point out that commodity producers in the forestry, mining, petrochemical, energy and manufacturing industries will not be able to export or import goods through a B.C. port affected by a strike, yet grain exports would continue.

Allowing grain exports to continue during a strike will likely prolong and not shorten work stoppages as employees providing services to grain vessels will have less incentive to settle.

There is considerable potential for transportation handling business usually undertaken by Canadian ports and railways to be lost as firms re-route their products and services through the U.S. Many commodities currently handled at west coast port facilities can be transferred to facilities in Seattle or Tacoma, Washington, or Portland, Oregon. Once business is lost, experience shows it is hard to get it back.

I have yet to hear any business or spokesman for port employees in my province requesting this provision or speaking convincingly in support of it.

On April 27 the British Columbia Employers Association asked the Minister of Labour for relief from section 87.7. It said:

We believe that—the discriminatory grain provisions unnecessarily threaten Canada's economy by jeopardizing Canada's reputation as a reliable importer and exporter of commodities to world markets. The impact on the western economy will be devastating.

The Business Council of British Columbia has also asked the Minister of Labour for relief. It states:

As you know from your consultation with western stakeholders as well as from numerous presentations made by western industries and associations to the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development, the special grain provisions contained in section 87.7—pose a serious threat to the competitiveness of west coast ports and the economy of western Canada as a whole—non-grain commodities represent up to 87% of the total dollar value of the cargo moved through the port of Vancouver alone—these commodities may remain stagnant in the event of an extended strike indirectly subsidized by the mandatory movement of grain.

Given the tenuous position of the current western economy as a result of the drop in world oil prices and the Asia crisis, such a threat to future economic stability could not come at a worse time.

Weyerhaeuser Canada, a Vancouver based company, believes section 87.7 needlessly threatens the forestry sector and potential-

ly the communities of western Canada that depend on exports and imports through the ports.

In conclusion, as a member of this House from British Columbia and having two major ports in my riding, I feel it is important that these matters and concerns be brought to the attention of this House and that the government take note.

• (1340)

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on the Group No. 6 amendments to Bill C-19. From the debate we have heard it appears that whenever one challenges the established order, one runs the risk of being called names. Symbolically what has transpired is that other parties in the House have been calling Reform names on this issue which is most unfortunate.

Forty per cent of British Columbia's gross domestic product comes from exports. The real question here is how to optimize society's benefits and at the same time create an enlightened framework for labour-management negotiations in those areas of federal jurisdiction. Just so people do not get confused on this issue, we are talking about a small portion of Canada's workforce which is associated with federal areas of jurisdiction.

I have a special place in my export file for forest products. I do that because the products from our forests are Canada's largest net export. This is something which is overlooked by virtually every walk of life in this country, particularly by politicians and our own bureaucracy. They are not our highest value export but we import almost no forest products. Having spent 20 years working in this business prior to my coming to the House of Commons, I know this has always been a bone of contention. It is overlooked. In any national strategy it is important to look at the net impacts of many of our exports.

The automotive trade represents 26% of our exports which is wonderful and marvellous and does a lot of great things, but we have a lot of automotive imports as well. It is a very different issue and a different strategy should apply.

With this set of amendments Reform is saying that we need to extend protection to all commodities. We cannot selectively experiment with protecting one group or commodity. To do so puts us in a perilous position. It also distorts the collective bargaining process. It tends to distort everything. Other members of my caucus have talked about the employer groups, the producer groups, the manufacturer groups, the exporters, all west coast based and all very concerned that anything other than equal treatment for commodities will lead to all kinds of difficulties.

In my view any treatment other than equal treatment for all commodities will lead to a need for constant government supervi-

Government Orders

sion, constant government intrusion and discriminatory treatment which will lead us who knows where. We will be monkeying with this legislation forever. We will be monkeying with the whole collective bargaining process. This is not good news at all.

One of our backgrounders describes this as an uncontrolled experiment being conducted by the federal government. There is an ongoing commission to review grain handling and the transportation system. It is reviewing that whole business in terms of labour relations. It is the Estey commission. That commission will not report until the end of this year.

• (1345)

In the meantime none of the legislation is based on anything substantive or concrete. It simply is not fact based. To justify it on the basis that it is temporary when it is so arbitrarily discriminatory and targeted makes no logical sense. The only conclusion that one can come to is that there must either be some special interest at work or some collective feeling that somehow this will make someone's life easier in this jurisdiction. Surely those are the wrong reasons to be doing what we are doing.

There has also been a suggestion that by somehow selectively targeting provisions in the act to only apply to grain will prevent labour disputes from escalating because grain can no longer be used as the commodity that will be at risk. That is also illogical. The same argument could be used for all other excluded commodities. As we know forest products represent by far the largest dollar value commodity moved through Canadian west coast ports.

We can identify no one who actually wants the legislation other than the people who created it and they are rather anonymous. We also know there is a split in cabinet over it. Once again we have the spectre of the west coast being burdened with a piece of legislation to its detriment by a non-west coast based group. This certainly does nothing to pull the country together.

We also seem to have a non-recognition of the marketplace serviced by the port of Vancouver. For example, the Asian market is the marketplace in the world that places the highest premium on predictability and timely delivery. That is a crucial consideration. The bill must address that issue and it must address it on a very even handed basis.

I will get back to softwood lumber. We have a circumstance where the government's posture on the Canada-U.S. softwood lumber agreement is that the agreement gives greater predictability for Canadian exporters that are planning to ship softwood lumber to the United States. There are thousands of British Columbians out of work because of that softwood lumber agreement. It is one more example of how the west coast cannot seem to permeate the bureaucracy that creates west coast based legislation.

Government Orders

• (1350)

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Oak Ridges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the official opposition is trying to do in the House what it failed to do in the committee, that is actually to take a constructive part in the debate other than the filibuster we witnessed the other week.

Let us make clear what it is trying to do. It is nothing less than to remove strike and lockout rights from employees and employers subject to the Canada Labour Code.

Motions Nos. 18 and 20 would add hardship to the national economy as a criterion for maintenance of service requirements while Motions Nos. 22 and 23 would prohibit all strikes and lockouts in the ports.

Members of the official opposition have stated that they support collective bargaining and the right of workers to what they call strike peacefully. What does strike peacefully mean? For most it means a work stoppage free of violence, but for the official opposition it would appear to mean that a work stoppage has no economic impact.

This is a complete contradiction. The entire purpose of a strike or lockout is to impose economic sanctions in order to convince the other party to agree to terms and conditions of a collective agreement.

In democratic countries such as ours the right of workers to organize and begin collective bargaining is a fundamental right. This right is recognized in the international bill of human rights and in International Labour Organization conventions to which Canada is a signatory.

In democratic countries the right to strike or lockout by private sector parties is limited only to the extent necessary to protect public health and safety. That is exactly what Bill C-19 proposes. There is no precedent in Canada to my knowledge for removing the strike and lockout rights from private sector parties for economic reasons.

Federally regulated employers and unions that negotiate under the Canada Labour Code specifically told the Sims task force—and I know the opposition remembers the Sims task force because we talked about it ad infinitum during the discussions—that they did not want their lockout and strike provisions removed. They did not want their disputes subject to binding third party determinations.

The federally regulated employers, transportation and communications, FETCO, which represents most major employers subject to the code said:

We do not want statutory authority to be given to the government to impose arbitration, alternative dispute mechanism, or unilaterally determine some of the provisions of the collective agreement itself.

The parties subject to the code agree that the appropriate criteria for maintenance of service requirements is protection of public health and safety.

On this point the Business Council of British Columbia told the task force:

The inclusion of a provision within the Canada Labour Code for designating “essential services” should be confined to matters deemed to be essential to the protection and maintenance of “public safety and health”.

The Sims task force did not recommend the removal of strike and lockout rights from any group of employees or any employer subject to the code. The vast majority of parties subject to the code do not support the removal of strike and lockout rights.

I urge members of the House not to support these amendments.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that every time I get up to speak to important bills it is just before question period. We know that once again my presentation will undoubtedly be interrupted by that frivolous use of an hour of House time.

It is a pleasure to rise today to speak once again to Bill C-19, the labour legislation that is before the House, and specifically to the Group No. 6 amendments.

Motions Nos. 18 and 20 by the official opposition deal with the fact that we are concerned the only provisions for preventing rail or shipping disruptions at the Vancouver port deal specifically with grain.

• (1355)

One might wonder why as the agriculture critic of the official opposition and a grain farmer for close to 20 years in the real world I would be speaking to expand it and why I would not be speaking in favour of this amendment.

While I do favour the fact that it is a small step in the right direction to have a process in place to ensure that the grain continues to flow through the ports, to meet our international commitments and to ultimately reach our foreign customers, the fact remains that it is specific to one commodity. I do not think even farmers would feel that is fair. There are many agricultural commodities other than grain that we ship abroad and on which we have important commitments to our foreign customers. It is very important that those commodities reach our customers.

One can readily see that while a lot of farmers including many in my riding, I am sure, support the particular clause in the legislation they are concerned with fairness and equity. They wonder why they are singled out. There has certainly been a history of rail and shipping disruptions at the ports that have cost the country and specifically farmers very dearly in the past. It has cost them hundreds of thousands of dollars in demurrage charges as ships sit

waiting to be loaded. That is ultimately reflected in the final payment that farmers receive from the Canadian Wheat Board.

As a young farmer trying to eke out an existence in the Peace River country I too from time to time was very angry when I would view the ships waiting in the harbour for days and weeks. I knew the mounting demurrage charges. I wanted to jump in my pick-up truck, tear off the 1,000 miles south to Vancouver and load the ships myself. I know many other young and older farmers felt the same way. They would have liked to have just gone down and loaded the bloody grain themselves rather than see it sitting on the wharf and not being shipped.

I see my time is up so I will continue after question period.

The Speaker: The member still has about six and half minutes and will be recognized right after question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

CANADA WORLD YOUTH

Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since 1971 Canada World Youth has been organizing the international exchange programs fostering leadership skills, cross cultural learning and social justice both locally and globally.

Funded in part by CIDA some 22,000 young people have taken part in the program which provides hands on work experience and participation in community and international development.

This year Jordan Hancey, a university student from my riding of Cambridge, has been chosen to take part in the Alberta-Poland exchange program.

I congratulate Jordan on his selection and I wish him every success as he prepares to represent Canada on this important cultural exchange.

* * *

PARKDALE CLEAN-UP DAY

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 9, Parkdale Collegiate Institute held its fourth annual community clean-up day in Parkdale.

First, I thank and congratulate the 200 volunteers who participated in that day. I also mention the strong support given to the clean-up day by the Parkdale Liberty Economic Development Committee, the Parkdale Village BIA, as well as the other community based groups that contributed so much to Saturday's success.

S. O. 31

In particular I underline the hard work and tremendous community spirit of two of Parkdale Collegiate's students, Rahel Beigel and Kevin Brijlal, who were the student co-ordinators for this year's event.

The benefits of a community clean-up day are plain to see. A more attractive neighbourhood encourages people to spend their time there and allows businesses to flourish but, more important, such activity also fosters a true sense of belonging. Safe and clean communities are prosperous communities, and prosperous communities are safe and clean communities.

It is a pleasure to salute such community spirit and I thank them all for their hard work.

* * *

● (1400)

CRTC

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when the heritage minister promotes Canadiana she really goes Hollywood.

The minister's CRTC licenses network and specialty TV channels mandating Canadian content. This drives a high demand for production but the dollars and cents simply do not add up to the commercial level.

As a result the minister directs spending of \$200 million to pay for the production of TV shows. So we have \$200 million a year dispensed through a nightmare of people with sleeping bags and tents waiting outside bureaucrats' offices trying to be first come first served.

The minister presides over a demeaning joke and it is getting worse.

The bureaucracy has already taken a \$20 million advance on next year's funding. Informed speculation says Canadians may be paying up to \$600 million a year if the minister gets her way. And who asked the taxpayer? Nobody.

Do they really want to pay for her fund? We demand a mandate review of the CRTC and its Canadian content rulings.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MEMBER FOR LONGUEUIL

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1993, the Bloc Quebecois refused to discuss the topic of my speech on paying a salary for women and men who stay at home.

Today, the Bloc Quebecois member for Longueuil is showing that she did not understand anything in my speech of April 28, 1998, and my motion of October 7, 1997, which read "That, in the opinion of this House, the government should legislate to pay a

S. O. 31

salary to the mothers and fathers who stay at home to raise their children". The hon. member should understand my whole speech, not just 23 words out of 1,500.

Mothers belong to one of two groups: those who work outside the home and those who stay at home. Today, I figured out the strategy of the Bloc Québécois member for Longueuil: she wants to stay in the third group.

* * *

[English]

POLICE WEEK

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is Police Week in Canada. It is an opportunity for all Canadians to show our gratitude and appreciation for the outstanding work performed day in and day out by our police and peace officers across the country.

This year in my riding of Waterloo—Wellington Police Week will be celebrated as follows:

there will be police displays in malls;

there will be seminars on various crime prevention tips and on personal safety;

there will be media announcements saluting individual officers;

there will be tours of police facilities; and

finally, there will be an awards night to recognize members of the community who assisted police in some very significant way.

On behalf of all residents of Waterloo-Wellington and on behalf of all Canadians, I thank all police for working so hard to make our communities the great places they are. Canadians respect them and Canadians salute them.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to commend the many beef cattle farmers and ranchers in every province of Canada.

I commend them for supplying a safe, healthy, nutritious, convenient product at a very affordable price.

I commend them for the large positive impact they have on the Canadian economy. Over 54% of Canadian beef production is exported to countries around the world, earning cash to be used to create a better Canada.

I commend them for the thousands of direct and indirect jobs they create for Canadians in rural and urban areas.

I commend them for their excellent stewardship of the land they use. Cattle ranchers were saving endangered species through

habitat preservation and improvement long before it became the in thing to do.

I commend the men, women and children who operate as a family unit in one of the most healthy, wonderful lifestyles known to mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask you and millions of other Canadians at your next beef barbeque to stop for a moment and give thanks to these farmers and ranchers. They truly are real Canadians.

* * *

TRADE

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we rush toward the 21st century trade barriers are being reduced to enhance commerce between nations.

In recent discussions with a constituent I became intrigued with the idea of establishing a centralized resource centre for importers and exporters, an international trade information centre.

This is an opportunity for our government to enter the 21st century as innovators in trade by providing one stop shopping for importers and exporters alike to attend information seminars tailor made to their needs, to have information material at their fingertips and knowledgeable personnel a simple phone call away.

As we continue to march into the shrinking world of a global economy it is apparent that such a resource centre would be a much needed facility not only for our traders but also for those who wish to trade with us.

The port of Fort Erie in my riding of Erie-Lincoln is adjacent to the U.S. border at Buffalo, New York, and is one of the busiest land crossings in the country. As new and renewed bridge infrastructure is being undertaken there is great potential in Fort Erie to become the highest volume port in the country.

Fort Erie would be an ideal location for an international trade information centre.

* * *

STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this Friday I will participate in the opening of a student employment centre in Kitchener.

Each year at this time we are faced with the struggle of students looking for summer jobs. As a mother of four I know this yearly ritual very well.

● (1405)

This government has made great progress not only in creating youth employment programs but also in providing access to information about programs available both to students and prospective employers throughout the Internet.

Experience Canada, Young Canada Works, SchoolNet Youth Employment, Youth Internships Canada, Summer Career Placements, Youth Info Line and Youth Info Site are all programs and services targeted at assisting students in finding summer jobs and breaking the cycle of no job, no experience.

I encourage all young Canadians to look into these initiatives. I encourage all employers to hire a student this summer, providing them with valuable experience that will last them a lifetime.

* * *

SURREY YOUTH RECOGNITION AWARDS

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on May 2 I had the pleasure of attending the third annual City of Surrey Youth Recognition Awards. On behalf of all of us in this place I wish to congratulate the following: Daniel Chapman, Armand Dhaliwal, Jesse Dosanjh, Amanda Ellestad, Marissa Hadland, Mary Illical, Todd Lajeunesse, Rachna Singh and Elizabeth Thampy.

From Tamanawis Secondary School I congratulate students: Meghan Anderssen, Amanda Cheung, Katie Henderson, Stephanie Kingdon, Laura MacKay, Ranjiv Manak, Reggie Sanantonio, Sean Vandergronden and Dawn Young.

From Queen Elizabeth Secondary School I congratulate students: Sueanne Amisola, Erin Ashenurst, Sarah Cathey, Dominique Chasse, Sarah Clark, Jennie Cline, Anshin Chu, Jennifer Derton, Johnny Faria, Brent Fraser, Gagandeep Luddu, Laura Maltman, Jennifer Neher, Kevin Redden and Joseph Siembida.

My apologies for any mispronunciations.

These young people of Surrey represent the vast majority of Canadian youth who truly are making a difference.

* * *

UKRAINIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Lou Sekora (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell all members just how proud I am of my Ukrainian heritage. If I speak in a unique way it is something I will wear as a badge of honour. My father, mother, grandmother and grandfather came to Canada in 1891 and settled near Hafford, Saskatchewan.

They were, in fact, the first Ukrainian family to settle in Saskatchewan. My family was among the thousands of immigrants from all over the world who built the west. We owe those pioneers an incredible debt of gratitude.

S. O. 31

I am proud to speak with a Ukrainian accent, but at the same time I am shocked at the Reform Party that would be asking me to speak English.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DAVID LEVINE

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the appointment of David Levine as chief executive officer of an Ottawa hospital is generating a lot of controversy in Ontario.

The issue is not Mr. Levine's great competence, but the fact that he was a PQ candidate 17 years ago. He is accused of being an old stock separatist. His appointment is perceived as posing a great danger to medical services in English in the Ottawa region.

Week after week, the federalists accuse us of wanting to promote ethnic nationalism. Yet, when a non-francophone Quebecker dares to support our political option, he is publicly condemned by all these great Canadians.

The whole episode involving Mr. Levine clearly shows that those who accuse sovereignists of creating ethnic divisions are in fact the ones who try to maintain such splits.

While we fear for the future of the Montfort hospital, some are now concerned about services in English in Ontario. This takes the cake.

* * *

[*English*]

SPORTS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, sports are an integral part of Canadian culture. In fact, during the Stanley Cup playoffs hockey becomes the cultural glue unifying Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

Canadian players are very competitive, yet when it comes to competing sports teams the Americans tilt the playing field and compete with an unfair advantage. Huge local, state and federal subsidies provide unfair advantages to professional sport teams based in the U.S. and it is time for us to act.

Canadian professional sporting teams have been harmed by unfair American subsidy policies which have reduced the operating costs of United States teams. The NAFTA establishes clear rules to prohibit these unfair practices. The Canadian government should initiate a dispute with the American government under chapter 20 of the NAFTA and seek compensation for the unfair U.S. policies.

On behalf of sports in Canada let us establish a backbone rather than a wishbone. Let us take some action.

S. O. 31

CANADIANNURSES

Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC): Mr. Speaker, this week Canadians are paying tribute to our Canadian nurses. These dedicated professionals are the backbone of our health care system. With compassion and wisdom they care for us when we cannot care for ourselves.

• (1410)

The Canadian Nurses Association, 110,000 members strong, continues to promote its profession and share its vision for the future of Canadian health care. They are fighters for a health care system that ensures Canadians have the highest standards of health care.

The theme for this week's events is "Nursing is the Key" and marks the 90th anniversary of the association. Today is also Florence Nightingale's birthday and Canada Health Day.

Congratulations to Canadian nurses for a job well done.

A recent poll listed the most appreciated and trusted professions. Guess who topped the list? Yes, that is right, Canada's nurses.

* * *

LUCIEN BOUCHARD

Mr. Gary Pillitteri (Niagara Falls, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my first impulse in commenting on Premier Bouchard's one person attempt to manipulate history was to shrug and say "What is new?"

On more thought, however, I realized what a horrible insult he had made to Quebeckers.

The rest of Canada may dismiss it as one more of the premier's childish tantrums, but when one recalls the blood and sacrifice of thousands of Quebeckers in World War II one sees how his actions approach sacrilege.

How can he dismiss the record of the Vandoos, the Maisonneuve, the Black Watch and others and their fallen comrades who left their blood, their dreams, their youth on the soil of Europe so that people like Premier Bouchard would have freedom of speech?

How can he forget General and Mrs. Vanier, one of Quebec's, and indeed Canada's, most famous families and their record of service to Canada?

Mr. Bouchard should hang down his head in shame.

* * *

LIVERPOOL REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, the riding of South Shore can claim a first that no other riding in Canada can claim. The first high school in Canada to attain the status of Earth

School, having completed 1,000 environmental action projects, is Liverpool Regional High School in Queens County, Nova Scotia.

There are 1,771 green schools in Canada that have completed 100 projects. This is the first goal in the SEEDS Canada program. To qualify as an Earth School the students must complete 1,000 environmental projects.

There are only 94 Earth Schools in Canada and the only one at the high school level is the Liverpool Regional High School.

Congratulations to the students, teachers and staff at the Liverpool Regional High School.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL NURSES DAY

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today, May 12, the birthday of Florence Nightingale, the famous lady with the lamp, is International Nurses Day.

I salute Canada's nurses with pride and respect, particularly my colleagues, the 67,000 nurses of Quebec. I recognize their competency, their professionalism, and above all their people skills. They are called upon to share people's suffering and grief, often in difficult, even painful, circumstances.

Nurses are everywhere, in the hospitals, in the CLSCs, in the schools, in the work place, in big cities and in outlying areas, playing a key role in both prevention and cure. The slogan of the Ordre des infirmières et infirmiers du Québec is "Consult a nurse".

That invitation will no doubt be accepted, because a CROP poll conducted in Quebec at the height of the ice storm crisis ranked nurses first among all professionals in terms of trust. You deserve our trust more than ever, and we thank you.

* * *

QUEBEC CITY CONFERENCES OF 1942 AND 1943

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, according to reports in this morning's newspapers, President Roosevelt was in favour of assimilating French Canadians. We are already familiar with the separatist habit of denouncing everything that is federalist or comes from English Canada.

Out of ignorance, or deliberate omission, they refused to give a statue of a Canadian Prime Minister the place it deserved on the occasion of the celebrations marking the Quebec City meetings of 1942 and 1943.

I trust that the leader of the Bloc Québécois will acknowledge his former leader has made a mistake and that justice will be done to Prime Minister Mackenzie King.

*Oral Questions**[English]***CANADIAN ARMED FORCES**

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, over the past several months the standing committee on defence has heard about the atrocious living conditions and the quality of life our military personnel are experiencing. The only real reason for this is that successive governments have overworked and under-equipped the members of our forces and have left them grossly underpaid.

• (1415)

At one of these committee meetings Colonel Jim Calvin reported that a fully trained private after three years services, married with two children, has only \$49 of disposal income a month.

At the same time we heard the solicitor general brag that our prison system is one of the best in the world, a system which provides inmates with the use of golf courses, big screen TVs, pool tables, et cetera. But most astonishingly, our inmates receive in some cases a monthly salary of \$157. This is more than three times what military personnel are forced to get by on.

The bottom line is that our convicts are being given more consideration by our government than our military personnel. How can we ever hope to recruit young people to serve our country, knowing that those in jail are treated better? They have to stand and—

The Speaker: Oral questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD*[English]***HEPATITIS C**

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the country's health ministers are meeting in two days to negotiate a solution to help all the hepatitis C victims. Yet this government has still not stated its position.

Canadians know what the government is against. They know that it tried to stonewall Krever. They know that it attacked the premiers. It has even tried to divide and conquer the hepatitis C victims themselves.

What is the government for? What positive position is it taking into these negotiations in two days?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, the provinces have expressed various posi-

tions. Some want to hold with the agreement that all governments entered into in March. Some want to reopen that agreement.

It is important for us to determine where the provincial governments are in this matter. We are having this meeting because of changes they made in their positions. It is important for us to know what position the provincial governments are taking.

On the basis of that, I will see on Thursday whether it is possible to develop a new consensus. It may not be possible based on what we are hearing. We will determine whether a new consensus can be forged on Thursday.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister went all around the bush but he did not answer the obvious question in the minds of the victims and in the minds of the provinces.

He talked about possible positions on the part of the provinces, but what is the position of the Government of Canada? What positive position on compensating all hepatitis C victims is this minister taking to this conference in two days?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it very clear. We said there was an agreement by all governments. As a result of the change in position by Ontario and in part by Quebec and perhaps others we should look again at the question and see whether a new consensus can be reached.

We are going to that meeting to determine what the positions are of the various governments. Once that is known it will be clear whether governments can act again in a concerted fashion to deal with this issue. It is in the best interests of all that governments act together and not unilaterally. Let us see what happens on Thursday and what the position of the provinces is.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this minister is running out of excuses.

First he said that every province agreed with him. Now that excuse is gone. Then he said there was no more money available. But then the premiers found a couple hundred million more dollars to put on the table. One by one the minister's excuses for inaction and not having a position are gone.

Is it not true that the only obstacle that is now standing between these victims and a just settlement is an obstinate Minister of Health who is unable to admit that he was wrong?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this, as on so many other matters, we disagree profoundly with the Leader of the Opposition.

Last summer, last fall, last winter, even into this year the provincial governments, especially Ontario and Quebec, took the position that they did not want to compensate anybody. It is as a result of the leadership of the Prime Minister and this government that we have the agreement we produced. After that agreement was

Oral Questions

reached, some provinces changed their positions. It is for that reason that I say let us hear them out. Let us find out what the position of the provincial—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Macleod.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting the way the government is treating the victims. The victims have said they do not want to be a prior audience to the meeting on Thursday.

• (1420)

Here is what the health minister has said to those victims: “I have proposed that we arrange to meet prior to the federal-provincial-territorial meeting of health ministers”.

Why does the health minister continue to treat these victims just like a photo op?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thought he would be the last person in this House to talk about using victims as photo ops.

Long before this member calculated what political benefit he could derive from exploiting victims, I was meeting with them. Long before this member knew what that ribbon was, I received one. Long before that man understood this issue, I was championing their cause. He ought to keep—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Colleagues, I am sure you want to hear the answers and the questions as much as I do.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, here is what the champion of the victims' cause said to them for the Thursday meeting. It is interesting to note. They know it is in Ottawa. They do not know what building it is in. They do not know what time it is and they do not have the agenda yet.

These people have to make travel plans. They do not have a limousine that will take them there. Why is this minister treating these victims so poorly?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the trouble with the Reform Party and this member is that when they pretend to speak of compassion for the victims, they lack credibility profoundly. They just are not credible.

We supported the resolution put by the New Democratic Party last week because we agreed that ministers should meet with victims and hear their perspective on these issues.

I have written to all provincial and territorial ministers. I have asked them to agree with me to receive victims early in the day before we consider any of these issues so that we can have their perspectives in our mind as we consult.

The Speaker: The hon. leader of the Bloc Quebecois.

[Translation]

POVERTY

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in response to the devastating statistics on poverty released by the National Council of Welfare, the Minister of Human Resources Development could find nothing better to say than this, and I quote “Canada no longer has a deficit, so poor families are richer”.

How could the minister make such a ridiculous and insensitive statement with respect to the millions of individuals who are victims of his government's policies?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Bloc Quebecois is being very selective in his reading of the press clippings prepared for him, because I said many other things about child poverty.

In particular, I said that it was a priority of our government, and that we had earmarked \$1.7 billion for the new national child benefit, a partnership with the provinces for improved programs and services.

We are giving the provinces \$25 billion under the CHST. We have increased child care deductions and further reduced Canadians' taxes—

The Speaker: The hon. leader of the Bloc Quebecois.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will go on with the list.

Does the minister realize that he is the one who is making poverty worse by slashing EI, by being complacent, by allowing the surplus in the EI fund to climb to scandalous heights, despite the crying needs of the public? Does he realize that the reason there are poor children is perhaps because there are poor parents?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, putting the economy back on track means taking decisions that are sometimes difficult. But we were also bold enough to propose EI reforms, which have also had a favourable impact in a great many cases.

For instance, we have amended EI to include a family income supplement for low income claimants with children. Claimants receiving the family income supplement are exempt from the intensity rule.

We have made it possible for those receiving EI to earn up to \$50 without losing their benefits.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this same Minister of Human Resources Development, through his reform of employ-

Oral Questions

ment insurance, together with the Minister of Finance has created the greatest poverty in Canada.

• (1425)

How can he be so insensitive as not to recognize that, by denying over 60% of the unemployed the benefits of the employment insurance plan, he is making hundreds of people poor in Canada every day?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with what is happening to poverty among children and because of where the people we are talking about come from, solutions must be found, and we in the government are looking for them.

We have made major reforms just so that parents will be able to go back to work more easily. We are providing active employment measures with substantial budgets to enable parents to return to the labour market, because the best guarantee against poverty is not unemployment insurance, but employment.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, given his attitude in the matter of the Atlantic groundfish strategy, does the Minister of Human Resources Development understand that he is once again condemning thousands of fishers in eastern Canada to poverty?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic groundfish strategy was our government's initiative in 1993 in response to the crisis people were facing in Atlantic Canada.

We are working very hard at the moment, this is a complex problem. We are looking for long term solutions to make sure people can earn a living with dignity and for a long time. This is what interests us on this side of the House, not petty politics.

* * *

[English]

NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. I am sure many Canadians were glad to see that the Canadian government deplored the detonation of nuclear bombs for testing in India yesterday. Many Canadians also deplore the way Canada contributes to the nuclear arms race through the export of nuclear reactors.

Is the government prepared in this context to reconsider its commitment to the export of nuclear reactors, in particular those being considered for Turkey in the near future?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are not pursuing a nuclear program aimed at helping any

country develop nuclear arms. More important, Canada has decided to recall its high commissioner to India for consultation in protest against the nuclear testing.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this kind of action would have more credibility if we were not committed to exporting the technology to make bombs. I ask the minister whether he would give more credibility to the Canadian position by finally showing some leadership within the context of Canada's membership in NATO and questioning the nuclear doctrine of NATO which holds that some countries should continue to have nuclear weapons forever. When will he seek the abolition of all nuclear weapons no matter what country has them?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has not provided any nuclear information to India since the early 1970s, so there could not possibly be a link between the unacceptable tests recently carried out by India and what Canada has been doing. With respect to the hon. member's point, I will certainly take it as a representation.

* * *

SUGAR QUOTAS

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, in 1995 the government bowed to U.S. pressure and agreed to lower our sugar quotas into the U.S. from 35,000 tonnes to 5,000 tonnes. After pressure from the sugar industry and the all-party sugar caucus we got it back up to 10,000 tonnes but the U.S. can ship 100,000 tonnes into Canada.

As a result of this agreement Lantic Sugar in Saint John, New Brunswick announced that it will be closing. This will put 240 more people out of work. What does the Prime Minister have to say to those 240 people, and their families, who will be out of work because this government freely sold out the interests of Canadians for its own convenience?

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we always regret the closing of an industry. I also should point out that Canada has taken steps in recent years to make sure that there is a viable industry in this country. I am sure my hon. friend will understand the terms of the re-export program and the fact that Canada would lose sugar producing industries to a greater extent if we did not have it.

• (1430)

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, we would still have our sugar industry if we had not undermined the whole sugar industry of Canada with the agreement.

Today those 240 people and their families are facing unemployment in a city where the unemployment rate is in excess of 13%. We have fishermen on both coasts wondering how they are going to

Oral Questions

support their families. Yesterday we had another report confirming that the poor are getting poorer because of this government's policy.

What is the Prime Minister going to do for these Canadians? When is the Prime Minister going to take responsibility for the consequences of his see nothing, do nothing government?

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would welcome a suggestion from my hon. friend to improve the situation we presently have. We have worked very hard to make this agreement on the re-export program beneficial to Canada.

* * *

TRADE

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, 17 Liberal MPs are flying with the Prime Minister on his latest junket, this time to Italy. No opposition MPs are going because this is not about government business. It is about Liberal party business. It is called taking care of favours. It is too bad the taxpayers are on the hook for the charges.

The Liberal MP for Niagara Falls said the trip is a great opportunity for him to make sales for his wine business. Why do taxpayers have to foot the bill so that this MP can make a personal profit?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not surprisingly the hon. member's numbers are wrong again. Let me give him the following information.

First of all Italy is the fifth largest economy in the world. It is Canada's 11th largest—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member across does not seem to know anything else about Italy other than the fact that it is shaped like a boot, by what he just said. I would like to think there are things more important.

We are talking about the relationship between two of the largest economies on the face of the earth. Italy is the 11th largest trading partner of Canada. We have asked MPs of Italian origin from all parties in the House to represent our country to enhance our trading and otherwise—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Fraser Valley.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if the government wants to build strong relationships with Italy, which it should, this is the wrong way to go about it. I will tell him that.

What the Liberals have done is they have waited until parliament takes a break. They have hired an airplane and will load it up with

good loyal Liberal backbenchers. They are toddling off for a vacation. There is nothing else, pure and simple.

Is it not true that this trip is not about building strong Italian-Canadian relationships? This trip is a reward for good loyal Liberal backbenchers.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is the hon. member suggesting? Does he want the members to go away while the House is sitting? Is this not the proper use of the break? Furthermore if the hon. whip was interested in promoting Canada's trade with Italy, then he and the other opposition parties would not refuse to send their members as part of the delegation. Let them show their sincerity by taking part in this mission.

* * *

[Translation]

POVERTY

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Poverty is on the rise in Canada and the government is still refusing to admit its responsibility in this phenomenon, which affects close to 18% of the Canadian population and more than 61% of single mothers.

• (1435)

Does the Deputy Prime Minister admit that the government bears a considerable portion of the responsibility for the rise in poverty because of the cuts it has made to the employment insurance program and to transfer payments to the provinces for health and social assistance?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, poverty is a difficult, challenging and complex phenomenon, and a priority for this government.

We are working as much as possible with the provinces and the provincial governments to contribute to a healthy economy which will enable people to earn a good living.

We have social programs in Canada that are working well. We have social programs that serve Canadians well and will be made even better in the coming years, now that we have reacquired some financial leeway.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government may well deny accusations that it is the one responsible for creating poverty, but can it deny that the number of poor people has been constantly on the rise since it came into power, despite the fact that the country is in a period of economic prosperity?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the welfare figures are constant-

ly dropping. Fewer families are on the welfare rolls, in Quebec, among others.

There is a lot of good news, which the opposition is determined not to note, even though their good buddies are the ones in government in Quebec at present. I find it amusing that they are suddenly attacking our government, when their own friends in the Government of Quebec also bear responsibility. There is a contradiction here.

What I can tell the House is that we are going to continue to work with our partners to ensure that the well-being of our fellow citizens is being properly looked after.

* * *

[English]

TRADE

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when the Liberals were in opposition they went up one side and down the other of Brian Mulroney for spending \$9.5 million on international travel in those five years. But since 1993 this Prime Minister has racked up over \$12 million in international travel.

I just have one question for the government. Why was it so bad when it was in opposition but it is so good when it is in government?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government will not apologize for Team Canada which is creating thousands and thousands of jobs for Canadians. We do not apologize for going to Italy to sell Canadian goods abroad. We will not apologize for going to South America to sell Canadian expertise, the best in the world. That is what this country is all about. We want to continue creating jobs notwithstanding the adverse wishes of the Reform Party.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: My colleagues, even with my microphone I am having a tough time up here. The hon. member for Edmonton North.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that sounds exactly like Brian Mulroney when he sat in that chair just ahead of the member.

Twelve million dollars and counting this Prime Minister spent. Nine and a half million dollars it was for Mr. Mulroney and he said "We don't apologize at all".

This Deputy Prime Minister in 1993 said it is egomania. If the shoe fits, they have to wear it.

Let me ask again. If it was so wrong for Mulroney, why is it so right for this Prime Minister?

Oral Questions

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is right in what she is saying, is she saying that hundreds of Canadian business men and women are wrong when they accompany the Prime Minister on these trips? Is she saying they are wrong, the Canadian business men and women, when they come back from these trips and say that they have signed hundreds of millions of dollars of trade deals?

These people say that the Prime Minister is right. These people by their actions say that the Reform Party on this, as in everything else, is wrong, wrong, wrong and wrong.

* * *

● (1440)

[Translation]

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, two days before the health ministers conference, we still do not know where the government is headed on the hepatitis C issue. So far, the minister has merely acted as an adjudicator between the provinces; he has not even had the courage of admitting responsibility.

Instead of playing adjudicator, should the minister not concentrate all his energy on actively seeking a solution, so that all hepatitis C victims can be compensated?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we must first find out what the provinces' positions are. I hope that Dr. Rochon from Quebec will attend Thursday's meeting, as I am anxious to find out Quebec's position. It is not quite clear right now, and I have a few questions for Dr. Rochon.

So, let us first ascertain the provinces' positions and then see if a consensus can be achieved among the provinces and the federal government.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister is trying to tell us that he is showing leadership. He should instead admit that Quebec and Ontario are the leaders on this issue.

Will he admit that a true leader would first and foremost tell us where he is headed and how he intends to address the problem?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[English]

INDIA

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, experts and foreign governments are saying that without Canadian technology the Indian nuclear program would not be where it is today.

It is time that the Liberals took some responsibility for the proliferation of this nuclear technology. What is this government

Oral Questions

going to do besides what many other countries have done in terms of our ambassador? What is this government going to do in the G-8, in the Commonwealth to stop this proliferation of nuclear material?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said that he intends to raise this with the other G-7 countries to see what appropriate action would be.

I want to repeat that Canada is not providing material to India or Pakistan to support their nuclear programs. Canada has not been involved in this way since the early 1970s. Canada deplores the actions of India in these tests. It has withdrawn its high commissioner. It intends to discuss the matter with its G-8 partners. This shows that we are very concerned about this and we are prepared and are taking concrete action.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is good enough. That just sounds like more Liberal rhetoric, protecting ministers of the past, Liberal governments that decided to export this technology. It is just not good enough for the minister to answer this way.

What kind of responsibility is this government going to take and what kind of leadership is it going to show to the world?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Candu technology sold to India in the 1960s and 1970s was in fact not used by India for the production of its first nuclear weapon back in 1974. After that Indian weapon test in 1974, Canada suspended all nuclear trade with India.

Thereafter the non-proliferation standards were also strengthened and total trade was terminated. This demonstrates that more than 20 years ago Canada was acting decisively to express our dissatisfaction with the kind of conduct that the hon. gentleman mentioned.

* * *

[Translation]

POVERTY

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, 5.2 million Canadians live below the poverty line. There is a direct link between poverty and access to credit, along with bank investment in underprivileged communities. In the United States, the Community Reinvestment Act regulates bank operations in these underprivileged communities.

Tomorrow, a private member's bill will be tabled in the House, asking that the banks reinvest in the community. Does the government intend to support this legislation, which is meant as a concrete measure against poverty?

• (1445)

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have said repeatedly that we do support the principle of

community banks. In fact, this is one of the reasons why we referred the issue to the MacKay task force. We are anxiously awaiting its recommendations, in September.

* * *

CALGARY DECLARATION

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Ontario released the results of its public consultation exercise on the Calgary declaration.

A poll conducted as part of this consultation shows that 87% of Ontarians support the declaration. This is consistent with the results of similar polls conducted elsewhere in the country, including Quebec, even though the Bloc would have us believe just the opposite.

Can the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs tell us more about the level of support for the Calgary declaration in Ontario?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc obviously does not like the Calgary declaration.

But Canadians, including Quebecers, find it a rather good initial gesture of openness that reflects the values which unite us, as was clearly shown by the recent consultation in Ontario.

Let me say to those who may have doubts about this consultation that a rigorous, scientific poll shows that 73% of Ontarians recognize the unique character of Quebec society.

* * *

[English]

RCMP

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today we learned that the RCMP has been called in by the government to investigate leaks to the *Globe and Mail* about the new TAGS program.

Why are the Liberal spin doctors so upset by this? Is it because the new TAGS program was leaked before they had a chance to do it?

Why is the RCMP investigating leaks to the media, something the government does every other day?

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the RCMP has been given information with regard to this situation and will take appropriate action as is befitting a law enforcement agency of its stature.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the justice minister's suggested changes to the YOA were all over the newspapers this morning hours before the official release.

Oral Questions

Will the solicitor general ask the RCMP to investigate that leak as well?

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times before, the government does not ask the RCMP to conduct an official investigation. It gives it information and the RCMP makes the appropriate decision based on 125 years of law enforcement in Canada.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, successive supreme court decisions reinforce the obligation of the federal government to uphold a fiduciary or trust responsibility toward aboriginal peoples.

The honour of the crown is the standard to which the courts hold all governments. Does the Liberal government still believe it has a fiduciary responsibility toward aboriginal peoples and does it still honour the crown when it intercedes in court cases?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, very clearly the government honours the fiduciary relationship that we see between the crown and first nations.

In Gathering Strength we also identify that it is appropriate for us to add other partners to our relationships so that we can altogether improve the lives of aboriginal people. That includes the provincial governments, municipal governments, third parties and the voluntary sector.

Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when in opposition the present finance minister called on the federal government to honour the tax immunity of aboriginal Canadians.

• (1450)

Now this justice minister has intervened on the side of the Government of New Brunswick to appeal a lower court ruling exempting aboriginal people from sales tax.

Could the justice minister explain how this action is consistent with the finance minister's previous statement, let alone the government's goal of working in partnership with aboriginal peoples?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the government is in no way inconsistent with our fiduciary obligation.

* * *

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice knows that the Young

Offenders Act is administered by the provinces and is supposedly funded 50:50 by the federal and provincial governments.

Yet the minister should also know that the real federal contributions only amount to about 30% of total administrative cost, downloading the majority of these expenses to the provinces.

Is her government prepared to put its money where its mouth is and make sure the provinces do not get stuck with the bill on her recent musings about changes to the Young Offenders Act?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me reassure the hon. member that we continue our cost sharing discussions with the provinces. I will not pretend those discussions are not without difficulty, but in most cases they are going forward quite well.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, according to the leak to the media yesterday the minister has no intention of lowering the age limit of the Young Offenders Act to cover those under the age of 12.

She should also know that children between the ages of 10 and 12 are being recruited by youth gangs to do their dirty work because they know they are exempt from prosecution.

Will the minister extend to parliamentarians the same courtesy she did to the media and confirm she has no intention of lowering the age of responsibility to under 12?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me reassure the honourable House that I have no intention before release of that document later this afternoon of commenting on its content. Let me reassure members of the honourable House that neither I nor my department had anything to do with that leak. In fact, let me reassure—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice, if she wants to continue.

Hon. Anne McLellan: The hon. member asked this question of my colleague, the solicitor general. I want to inform the honourable House that the RCMP has been asked to investigate the leak, the alleged leak, regarding our response—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I cannot wait for tomorrow. The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

* * *

TRADE

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade. It is about a

Oral Questions

recent move by U.S. customs to reclassify predrilled boards as ordinary lumber.

This seems to contravene the free trade agreement and will threaten jobs in western Canada. How will the government protect the Canadian lumber industry from this threat?

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I commend my hon. colleague for keeping the government fully aware of the importance of this issue.

On May 7 the government met with the stakeholders in the softwood lumber issue. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the recent reversal of the U.S. customs service proposal to reclassify drilled studs.

• (1455)

We will be commenting on the proposal by May 15 and we intend to pursue the matter vigorously.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

A Vancouver immigration consultant, Iraj Rezaei, is facing 18 charges ranging from passport forgery to counselling false refugee claims, to threatening and assault. While he awaits trial he continues to counsel unsuspecting immigrants via his new website on the Internet.

Has the minister asked the Minister of Justice to seek an injunction to stop this evil man from practising his fraudulent trades?

[Translation]

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, I cannot comment in any detail on the case of a person currently residing in Canada, but I can assure the hon. members of this House that our Immigration Act contains all of the mechanisms necessary to deal with these actions by individuals.

* * *

VARENNES TOKAMAK

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today the verdict was brought down. The Varennes tokamak is shutting down, after winning an award of excellence for its work. How ironic!

Is the government not ashamed of having been so shortsighted as to bring about the death of this highly promising research project, in order to save \$7.2 million, after 20 years of successful efforts and more than \$150 million in investments?

[English]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the course of the government's program review process some very difficult decisions had to be made about priorities.

It was determined in that process that fusion research which has a payback that is at least 30 to 40 years in the future could not at this time be a priority.

Over the course of the last number of years we have invested something in the order of \$90 million in the facility at Varennes. We provided an additional \$19 million to assist with an orderly shutdown.

Unfortunately, in terms of establishing priorities and living within the confines of fiscal responsibility, tough decisions have to be made.

* * *

HEALTH

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister of Health about unlicensed blood products being used in hospitals without the knowledge or consent of patients.

Today we have learned the situation is even worse than we thought. The chair of the transfusion practices committee of the Health Sciences Centre in Winnipeg says unlicensed human serum albumin is being used 100% of the time.

What steps is the minister taking to deal with the apparent shortage of fractionated blood products? Could he explain how it is that we have unlicensed product on the market five months after the government established the licensing requirements?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a result of the facts referred to by the hon. member yesterday in question period, officials have been requested to look into the matter to find out what the facts are. I will respond to the hon. member's questions of yesterday and today as soon as they have completed that inquiry.

I share her concern that either unlicensed or unsafe products may be used. I also worry about the blood supply in general and the shortage. We continue to encourage donors to be as generous as they have in the past.

I will respond to the member when I have the information.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Charlie Power (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

The number of American work visas issued to Canadians has increased over 50% in just four years. There is one major reason for

this. Our government continues to follow high tax policies which drive our best and brightest south of the border.

My question is for the minister. When will the government offer real tax relief so that those Canadians who choose to stay at home and work will not at the same time be taking a vow of poverty?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the high tax policy in this country was established by the previous government.

Since we have taken office we have brought in a series of targeted tax reductions. In the last budget I am delighted to announce that we were able to take off the 3% surtax imposed by the Conservative government for 83% of Canadians.

* * *

• (1500)

NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Natural Resources.

Following India's alarming nuclear test yesterday many in the international community are pointing to Canada as a source of technology transfer. India entered into agreements with Canada regarding the peaceful use of these technologies.

What safeguards exist in these sales of nuclear technologies?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to make this very clear. After the first deplorable test by India back in 1974, Canada suspended all nuclear trade with India. We then developed a much more stringent non-proliferation policy in the mid-1970s.

In 1976 Canada terminated all nuclear trade with India after it became clear India would not comply with our non-proliferation policy.

Any reactor, researcher or otherwise sold or provided to any country today would have to adhere to those much higher standards that apply in this day and age.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MEDIA LEAKS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my point of order arises out of something that was raised in question period but which I think should more properly be raised under a point of order. The government has asked the RCMP to launch an investigation into the supposed leaks of the government's policy on the TAGS program, thus intimidating the media and

Government Orders

public servants while at the same time and on the same day as this announcement is made we see the details of the government's response to the Standing Committee on Justice with respect to the YOA all over the newspapers this morning.

These are sort of two points of order, Mr. Speaker, but I hope you will hear them both at once. There is the point of order having to do with the fact that the government is very concerned and sanctimonious when other people leak information and yet there is good reason to believe, although the minister denies it, that the government does from time to time deliberately leak details of responses or proposals that it is going to make the following day.

My other point of order which deals with the same thing is that if the minister is making a response to a committee report it should be done either in the House or in committee and not in the context of a media announcement.

Both these things have to do with respect for the House of Commons and the fact that the business of the House of Commons should be conducted in the House of Commons. We want to see—

The Speaker: The point of order the member brings up is surely an opinion which rightly takes place in debate. With regard to the leaks, from what I heard today there are two investigations going on. I rule at this time that this is not a point of order.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1505)

[English]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 18, 20, 22 and 23.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, before question period I was speaking from a farmer's perspective to Motions Nos. 18, 20, 22 and 23.

I was trying to speak from a farmer's perspective, having farmed for close to 20 years in the British Columbia Peace River region, growing grain, grass seed and oilseed. I was remarking on how angry farmers become when they see the shipments of grain which are supposed to be freely flowing through the ports on to ships for shipment to our foreign markets, our overseas customers, delayed and held up in some cases for extended periods of time and the resultant cost that ultimately the farmers and the country pay.

Government Orders

I have heard from quite a number of farmers who grow these crops, the six standard grains, wheat, barley, oats, rye, flax and canola which I am assuming are included under this definition of exclusion from any possible strike action at the ports. They are quite concerned because they want to see this bill proceed so that they do receive that protection.

The end result is that we are going to be enshrining inequity and unfairness with the passage of Bill C-19 as it is presently written. That is why the official opposition has put forward Motions Nos. 22 and 23. It is to drop the inclusion pertaining simply to the standard grain crops. We feel that it discriminates.

I have not heard the answer from the government benches on whether specialty crops would be included under this protection. A lot of farmers are growing so-called specialty crops. Lentils, peas, fava beans, sunflower, safflower, these types of crops are being grown on increasing acreage across the land. In particular I am speaking about western Canada. I wonder if they are protected under this same clause. I do not think so. I think this clause simply pertains to the standard grains.

As we expand these markets for these specialty crops the bill is going to discriminate against some producers and thereby pit farmer against farmer when there are strikes or lockouts at the ports.

Motions Nos. 18 and 20 put forward by Reform have been open to attack, in particular from members of the fourth party, the NDP, saying they are unfair because they pertain to expansion of this restriction of strikes to protect the national economy.

• (1510)

In other words, if it can be shown that a strike or lockout has a profound impact on the national economy, it would not be allowed. Because of that, members of the NDP have suggested that we are being unfair to the unions and that no strikes would be allowed.

In fairness to their arguments, we cannot consider Motions Nos. 18, 20, 22 and 23 in isolation. We must consider them in tandem with the Group No. 8 motions, which have not yet been debated. These deal with Reform's proposal for final offer selection arbitration.

To make my point I refer to *Hansard* and quote the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre on February 10, 1998:

In the province of Manitoba where I am from we actually had final offer selection legislation for a number of years.

The actual fact is in Manitoba FOS was used very sparingly. In fact, the Manitoba labour relations board received only 97 applications in all the time that it was legislation in that province. Of those 97 applications only 7 were ever ruled on by an FOS selector or arbitrator. Four went to the union package and three were in favour of the company in those rulings. In the vast majority of cases, 72 in all, the application was withdrawn because the parties returned to the bargaining table and found a satisfactory resolution by more convention means.

The point I am making is that by his very admission, the hon. member from the New Democratic Party is saying that final offer

selection works. In 72 of those cases the parties returned to the bargaining table and ultimately reached a satisfactory resolution to their dispute. The process worked. I add that as further confirmation that the Reform amendments to this legislation deserve serious consideration by all parties. When it comes time to vote on these motions, I urge all members to consider that and vote accordingly.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Order, please. I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Government House
Ottawa

May 12, 1998

Mr. Speaker:

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Antonio Lamer, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity of Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 12th day of May, 1998 at 4 p.m., for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Judith A. LaRocque
Secretary to the Governor General

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 18, 20, 22 and 23.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take part in this debate today on report stage of Bill C-19, specifically Group No. 6 amendments.

• (1515)

Unfortunately I am not happy about the way this is proceeding. In the last five years since I have been involved we have seen all too much of this in the House of Commons, that is, the use of closure to shut down debate on very important issues. It is very ironic. The Liberal government across the way was very critical of the Mulroney government for the use of closure and time allocation when the Liberals sat in opposition, but this is the 40th occasion where it has been used in the last five years.

It is a misuse of power by the government to use it in this manner. There is a very important principle involved, which is that all members should have the right to debate these important issues. This is the first opportunity I have had for a 10 minute debate on Bill C-19, the changes to Canada's labour code.

The area I would like to discuss stems from my role as critic for international trade. It deals with the Vancouver terminals, specifically section 87.7 under Motions Nos. 22 and 23 being proposed by my Reform colleague, the member for Wetaskiwin.

I am concerned that if the principle of allowing movement of grain for 72 hours after a strike or lockout notice has been given is such a good principle, why it is not applied to all commodities.

As recently as Wednesday last week, I had a meeting with the hon. Pat Nelson, the minister of economic development for the province of Alberta. She wanted me to bring the point to the floor of the House of Commons that it is very important to ensure we have good movement of our commodities through the terminals, through the port facilities, so we can continue to have good service and enjoy a good reputation worldwide. I am concerned that our reputation for delivery is not as good as it should be.

It is important also to note that Canada had the most time lost to labour-management strikes and lockouts of any industrial country except for Italy in the last 10 years. It is a deplorable state for a big country like Canada which relies on exports, on international trade to supply the world.

I am aware that the member from Regina, the former minister of agriculture, accompanied a group to Japan a year ago. They were trying to reassure the Japanese of Canada's ability to deliver in a timely manner products through our ports both in Vancouver and in Prince Rupert.

My concern has to do with grain itself. The Minister of Labour and others in the government are trying to win support from grain farmers across Canada by saying that if something happens and there is a strike or lockout at the Vancouver port, they will continue to load grain into an ocean-going vessel for 72 hours. This is true. However, it does not deal with any of the problems originating from the farm gate to the terminal. It does not deal with any problems in the railway system. There are something like 20 different labour-management units along the way that can disrupt the flow of grain during that time. It does not deal with things that my colleague from Prince George—Peace River, the critic for agriculture talked about.

When it says grains, the grains identified do not include alfalfa pellets. In my riding of Peace River, we have the world's biggest alfalfa pelletizing plant, Falher Alfalfa. It is very concerned that this section does not deal with Neptune terminals. It does not deal

Government Orders

with Vancouver wharf. There is a \$25 million operation that can be shut down.

If this principle is the sound principle the government is putting forward, why would it not extend it to things like specialty crops, like alfalfa, peas, lentils and all the other grains?

There is a real problem here and we have an opportunity to correct that problem. My colleague from Wetaskiwin has said that this is the first time the Canada Labour Act has been opened up in 25 years and it probably will not be opened up again for some time.

We are looking for this opportunity to make substantial changes now when the debate is happening. We encourage members in the Liberal government to listen to some of the reasoned amendments we are putting forward with a view to trying to improve Canada's delivery out of our port system.

• (1520)

A lot of other products are being handled in Vancouver. In Prince Rupert there is coal. We have sulphur. One of my colleagues has already mentioned that lumber is one of our biggest ones. Chemical potash and various other products are being exported worldwide. This legislation does not deal with that.

Our party thinks a more reasoned approach to this would be to go to final offer arbitration. What it does is it allows for the parties to negotiate for some time before the labour-management contract is finished. I would think negotiations should start if it is a three year contract a year ahead to see if they can come to some kind of an agreement. If they cannot, having a strike or lockout and withdrawing services has the effect of shutting down the terminal and in some cases shutting down the port.

As a grain farmer myself in the Peace River country I know the devastating effects of having some 20 ships sitting in English Bay harbour at Vancouver and paying demurrage of about \$60,000 a day for each ship. It is a very big bill, millions of dollars. Last year it was approximately \$60 million that grain farmers had to pay because of the ships that were waiting for product because there was a strike lockout situation at the Vancouver terminals.

We have to correct that. Canada has a reputation that has to be enhanced otherwise we are going to be bypassed. Products will be bought from the United States. I suggest we look at final offer arbitration as one way of resolving this.

Final offer arbitration needs to be explained a little. In a labour-management contract quite often when the contract is being negotiated the two parties will start a long way apart. If a labour union wants a 5% increase quite often it will ask for 7% or 8% knowing it will probably be negotiated down and it will be settled somewhere in the range of 5%. On the other hand the company quite often starts at a position recognizing that it is going to be a 5% settlement and starts negotiating at 3%. This goes on for

Government Orders

months and months before they finally come to some kind of a settlement. Often there is time lost in that bargaining unit where labour is withdrawn or there is a lockout. This has a very devastating effect on the Canadian economy.

Final offer arbitration is a reasonable way to approach this. Approximately one month prior to the contract expiring if a settlement had not been reached by negotiations, each party would have to submit a reasonable final offer. I suggest reasonable. They would not have to submit a reasonable one but an independent third party looking at it would choose the more reasonable of the two. It would be in their best interests to submit a reasonable final offer. The arbitrator would decide which one looks more reasonable than the other and would choose that one and the parties would have to live with it.

In the event that did not happen, if one party put in a very unreasonable final offer and the other party did not, we know what would happen. The effect of that would be to have the two parties put in a reasonable offer at the start. It would prevent a lot of the problems we have in the labour-management area. Canada could enhance its reputation as being a reliable supplier.

If we miss this opportunity I think we are missing an opportunity that is going to cost future jobs. Canada relies on our exports for about one-third of our gross domestic product. That means 40% of the jobs of every Canadian family, every community rely on our ability to export. We know that some of our exports go through the United States but some go through our port cities as well.

This is an opportunity we want to seize. The government should look at these as reasonable amendments and adopt them.

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today in the House and speak on Bill C-19 and the amendments that have been put forward at this time.

A number of us will remember the eminent Canadian poet Robert Service who talked about strange things being done in the midnight sun in the Yukon. There have been some strange things done here in the midday sun in this House today. I have heard some. I have seen some.

● (1525)

First of all the government is putting time allocation on another bill that is before the House. The government when it was in opposition so quickly condemned the Conservatives for doing the very same thing and it continues to do this time after time. That concerns me very much, the limit on our free speech and on the democratic process in the House.

All Canadians should be concerned about the way the government is using time allocation to shut down democracy in the House. This is the parliament of all Canadians. We come here to represent

them. If we do not have an opportunity to voice the concerns of Canadians here in this place, I ask all hon. members, where will Canadians have that opportunity if it is not here in the House through their duly elected members? I am very concerned about that.

I am also very concerned when I hear NDP members taking shots at the Reform Party inaccurately telling the Canadian people untruths about us, saying that we are against fair wages. What balderdash that we would be against fair wages. That is absolute nonsense. I want to suggest that the NDP cannot teach the Reform Party anything about economic policy or fair labour practices.

Perhaps the member should go to my province of British Columbia to see what an NDP government has done to the economy of that province. The member should see what kind of legislation it has tried to impose upon businesses in that province with unfair labour codes and see the kind of public revolt against that which occasioned that government to take the legislation out of the legislative docket.

We have just gone through a devastating strike in my riding of Nanaimo—Cowichan at the Fletcher Challenge mill. When we as Reformers say that we stand up for people who do not seem to be able to be heard in this country, that strike was another example of this very thing. That mill produces pulp and paper which contributes 53% of the tax base of the municipality which it is in. When its workers go on strike and labour and management cannot come to some kind of consensus, there are lots of third parties in that riding that are hurt far beyond the union members and far beyond the management and those who own the mill.

All the businesses suffer because of a strike that goes on and on. The small businesses lay off employees because people are no longer buying their goods. Car dealers have seen their sales plummet in January, February and March because of the strike.

The NDP members miss a big point in this whole debate when they only stand up for big unions. Someone has to stand up for the little ordinary guy in this country who feels that he has no voice in these kinds of occurrences in our society when prolonged and protracted labour-management disputes paralyze other industries and other businesses. Something has to be done about that.

In terms of Motions Nos. 18 and 20, we are concerned that there is no provision in the bill to protect the national economy.

We are concerned about Motions Nos. 25 and 29 that prohibit the use of replacement workers if the CIRB determines their presence undermines the union. This was a slight modification from previous Bill C-66, but this provision still leaves too much control in the hands of the CIRB which may view the use of replacement workers as undermining the union.

• (1530)

This provision could very well stop the use of managerial staff from operating the company. It restricts and infringes on the employer's rights. Somewhere along the way in this national debate on restructuring this kind of thing employers have to be able to have their say in this House of Commons and the employers that we hear from are saying that this is unfair and it needs to be changed.

It very well could shift the balance of power in labour management relations in favour of the unions. The *Globe and Mail* on November 5, 1996 quoted Nancy Riche, the executive vice-president of the Canadian Labour Congress, as saying: "I would go so far as to suggest that anybody who does work of a member of a union undermines the representative capacity of the union". She went on to say: "None of the bureaucrats are going to agree with me—but we'll have to wait and see. The new board will rule".

We in the Reform Party have some real concerns about this and that is why we have proposed this amendment.

I hope that all hon. colleagues in this House will not close their minds so easily to the amendments that the Reform Party has put forth in this regard, that they will see all sides of the debate and realize that there is more to this country than big business, big government and big union.

There are little people, hard working little people, who need to be heard in this country and it seems that the only party that is willing to stand up for them today, as it did in the hepatitis C debate, is the Reform Party.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are speaking today on motions to amend Bill C-19. This bill provides for changes to the Canada Labour Code and the opposition parties have put forward a number of amendments, in fact eight groups of motions to amend the bill, and there are a few motions in each of these groups.

Now we are speaking to Group No. 6. There are four motions in this group. The first two motions essentially add to the grounds for prohibiting the cutting off of services in the event of a strike. The bill provides for continuation of service in a strike situation if public health or safety is endangered. The amendments that we have brought forward would also provide for continuation of service to protect the national economy.

I listened with great interest to the comments of the member for the New Democratic Party on this series of amendments. What was so interesting to me was that the member really did not address at all the substance of these amendments or argue that the national economy, in the short term, could not be affected, so therefore we do not need the amendments. There was none of that.

Government Orders

The total tone of his speech was attributing motives. He talked about the deep bitterness of Reformers against workers, many of whom support the Reform Party, so I am not quite sure why we would be anything but approving of that.

• (1535)

There is a labelling, an attributing of motives and a real agenda here. I assure Canadians watching this debate that the agenda of the official opposition in putting forward amendments and in speaking to this bill is simply to protect Canadian workers and the well-being of Canadians in our labour legislation and in the way labour and business operate in our country. We are dependent on good economic results from the activities that take place. That is our motive and that is what we want to do in a very balanced, sensible and thoughtful way.

I urge members of the NDP and other parties to stick to the practical issues being raised and not to continue with their agenda of suspicion, conspiracy and some of the other things they seem to think are happening in this debate, because that is not the case.

There has been no disagreement that services should be continued in federally regulated sectors if public health and safety could be endangered by services being cut off. No one is disagreeing with that. We would argue that danger to the national economy should also be a consideration. Health and safety are immediate dangers and immediate harm could be caused by services being cut off. The danger and harm to a national economy can cause every bit as much pain and hardship. It can contribute every bit as much to the poverty of Canadian families as cutting off services in areas where health or safety is immediately impacted.

We need to think a little more broadly and long term when we give carte blanche to strikes and lockouts that impact people's livelihoods, their businesses, their incomes, their ability to pay their rent and mortgage, and their ability to put milk on the table for their children. We have to think of those things. We cannot just look at some immediate danger. We have to look at the impact over a little longer period of time that can be equally devastating. That is the intention of this amendment.

There is a cost to Canadian families and to Canadian workers in particular. Many of these workers are barely making ends meet as it is, thanks to the taxation policies of this government and the cost of living in Canada. They depend on the viability of the whole local economy and a strike can be critical in impacting their short term and long term well-being.

This motion is designed to protect the national economy and thereby to protect regular Canadians with their day to day bills, their day to day need for income and their day to day need to make sales in their little businesses in the towns where they work. We need to think about these things. We need to protect the Canadians

Government Orders

of this country. If services are cut off in an area due to a strike or a lockout, and if it happens federally across the country, the industrial relations board needs some ability to determine what is going to be the impact on the national economy and thereby on the families and workers of Canada and those who are dependent on economic activity for their well-being.

This is a very sensible amendment that looks at the bigger picture. It tries to protect people from some of the so-called unintended consequences of labour unrest and labour shutdown. We need to look in a very balanced and logical way at whether this ought to be done. We should not close our minds and shoot the messenger, we should deal with the message and its merits.

• (1540)

I would urge all members to think about what is best for Canadians. That is why we are here. That is why we get the big money. That is why we get the airtime. We need to be very focused on what is best and look at the proposals on their merits. I think this proposal has a great deal of merit.

We also, of course, as a number of my colleagues have said, urge that other commodities be protected from disruptions in shipping besides just grain. There are farmers who have interests in different commodities. We know that some of the wheat pools support this legislation because grain is protected. But again we have to think more broadly, not just in a narrow sense. There are some very clear concerns about unintended consequences if only grain is protected from disruptions in shipping.

A number of people who work in the sector say that labour unrest and disputes will be extended and enhanced if only grain can be shipped because, in a sense, that commodity will be used to subsidize strike activities that hold up other commodities. Some income would come in from that one narrow sector, but the other sectors will still be disrupted and there will be less incentive to settle those disputes because they are not as harmful to the participants.

Our amendments are designed to look at the big picture, to look at other products that need to be shipped, such as coal, lumber, chemicals, potash and other commodities. I would ask that my hon. colleagues in this House look at these proposals on their merits. I believe then they will be soundly supported.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is truly a privilege to be able to speak to the motions in Group No. 6.

We have had the opportunity to talk about Bill C-19 a number of times in the House. I have to start off by saying that it is despicable when the government uses closure on a bill like this. This bill will affect every single farmer in western Canada. It will affect anybody, basically, who has anything to do with the movement of products across this country. The government owes the Canadian

people the opportunity for us to debate this openly and talk about this issue as it will affect all Canadians.

The sort of thing that this government persists in doing is despicable. It is disgraceful. It is anti-democratic. It has used closure more than any other government in the history of this country. Canadians are watching and are going to demand some accountability for this sort of action.

The key thing about this amendment and the key thing about this bill is the protection of the economy of Canada. That has to be number one. We are talking about jobs and the standard of living that we have grown used to as Canadians, and we are falling behind.

I have had the opportunity to travel to many parts of the world and I have started to realize more and more what is happening to us as Canadians.

I cannot help thinking about last Friday when I was going to the airport. The cab driver said to me "The Ottawa Senators are not going to lose another game. They are way better than the Capitals and they will beat them hands down". That is a little bit like we sometimes hear the Prime Minister talk about Canada. The United Nations says we are number one; therefore, we do not have to work harder. That is wrong. We have to continue to work. The world around us is becoming more competitive and we must be conscious of that.

In travelling recently to China, seeing the changes that have occurred there and having the opportunity to talk to some of our shippers and some of our businessmen, I asked: "What do you think of Canada looking from here back there?" The message that I got was "We don't deal with Canada as much as we used to". They do not feel that there are the same opportunities, that there is the same aggressive tendencies to try to sell them something, particularly when it gets to things such as wheat.

• (1545)

I talked to a brewer who is responsible for buying malt barley for 150 breweries. He said he does not go to Canada any more for supplies. He does not go to the Canadian Wheat Board because he is not sure about whether delivery will come or when it will come. He indicated that there seemed to be many problems with guaranteeing delivery.

I talked to a Japanese shipowner who indicated a problem. He books his ships on a two year basis and allows so many days for sailing, so many days for loading and so many days for getting to the port of destination. He said he could not come to Canada because his ship might be sitting for 30, 40 or 50 days as a result of some transportation blockage or of some strikes that are so frequent.

Government Orders

That is what is hurting us as Canadians. We can talk about strikes and the national economy. However, we have to ask ourselves, going into the 21st century, what happens when a strike is called. We know for sure union bosses keep getting the salaries they have been getting. We know union members who go on strike do not get the salaries they have been used to getting, and if they are out for very long we know they never make up that money again.

We certainly know the economy of the country is hurt. We certainly know many people, for example farmers, are hurt. Let us just stop for a minute and look at the farmer. He has a lot of decisions to make. He has to decide when to plant, what to plant, what kind of fertilizer to use, what kind of seed to use, and then depend on the weather. He should not also have to depend on the unions to get his commodity to market and ultimately get paid for it.

Those people are hurt. The whole country is hurt in terms of our reputation because we do not have modern labour practices that allow us to be competitive.

A question has to be asked. There must be a better way than having strikes. There must be a better way than Bill C-19 which is liberal in its makeup. It goes a little way here and a little way there and does not stand for very much. No one really knows what it means. It certainly does not improve either the economy of country, the well-being of our people or our reputation internationally.

Instead of resting on our laurels it is time that we examine different ways of handling the situation. The motions put forward would help us to do it.

I will speak specifically to Motion Nos. 18 and 20 which the Reform Party has put forward. What effect would they have on our national economy? That becomes the number one issue when we decide what will happen. They also talk about protection not only of our economy but of third parties.

Going on to Motion Nos. 22 and 23 the key issue, as the previous member mentioned, is that all commodities be included. It is not enough to only include grain. We should be including many other things that move through our ports. On the prairies there are all kinds of different products. Right across the country we have products that depend upon transportation and upon the movement of goods.

We need to look at better ways. We need to examine them. I do not think it is fair to say that any one of us is anti-union. That is not the message. The message is that we have to find some other way to deal with the problem of labour disputes other than strictly going on strike. I hope the day will come when strikes will be a thing of the past.

• (1550)

It is also important to emphasize that we have to do what is good for the country and its economy. We have an international reputa-

tion to worry about. I am worried the government is not listening. I suppose it would argue that because of the huge turnout it is listening and is here to understand exactly what the message is.

However it is a little hard sometimes to see its members through the fog, but I am sure they are over there listening very carefully to the message that our member from Wetaskiwin has led us through in the debate on Bill C-19.

The bill is too little too late. The government is not listening to the people. The bill is out of date and back in the 1970s which is where most government members are at. It does not show any kind of vision for the 21st century. It will certainly not help the economy or the people of Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The question is on Motion No. 18 in Group No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 18 stands deferred. Accordingly the recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 20.

The next question is on Motion No. 22. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 22 stands deferred and will also apply to Motion No. 23.

Just before we go to Group No. 7, for the information of hon. members present and those in the gallery in about 10 minutes we will be going to the Senate for royal assent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by adding after line 39 on page 28 the following:

“(1.1) During a strike or lockout not prohibited by this Part, no employer or person acting on behalf of an employer shall use the services of a person who was not an employee in the bargaining unit on the date on which notice to bargain collectively was given and was hired or assigned after that date to perform all or part of the duties of an employee in the bargaining unit on strike or locked out if the employees of the bargaining unit continue the activities referred to in subsection (1) in the manner prescribed by that subsection.”

[*English*]

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-19, in Clause 42, be amended by deleting lines 28 to 38 on page 33.

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): moved:

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-19, in Clause 42, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 38 on page 33 with the following:

“(2.1) No employer or person acting on behalf of an employer shall use the services of a person who was not an employee in the bargaining unit on the date on which notice to bargain collectively was given and was hired or assigned after that date to perform all or part of the duties of an employee in the bargaining unit on strike or locked out.”

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC) moved:

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-19, in Clause 42, be amended by adding after line 38 on page 33 the following:

“(2.2) For greater certainty, an employer shall be deemed not to have undermined a trade union's representational capacity by reason only of the employer's use of the services of a person referred to in subsection (2.1).”

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 29

That Bill C-19, in Clause 45, be amended by deleting lines 15 to 24 on page 36.

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there has been consultation among the parties and I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or special order, any division requested on Private Members' Business, Motion No. M-75 or Bill C-247, shall be deferred to the expiry of the time for government business on Monday, May 25.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 19, 25, 26, 27 and 29.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Order, please. I wish to inform the House that there is an error in today's notice paper and in the voting pattern in respect of Motion No. 27 in Group No. 7.

A vote on Motion No. 25 applies to Motion No. 29. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 25 obviates the necessity of the question being put on Motion No. 27. On the other hand, a negative vote on Motion No. 25 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 27. Motions Nos. 19 and 26 will be voted on separately.

Revised voting patterns and report stage charts are available at the table. I regret any inconvenience this may have caused hon. members.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I thank you for reading Motion No. 26 in its entirety. We asked you to do so on a matter of principle and as a symbolic gesture. Given the importance of this motion, we wanted it recorded properly in the *Debates of the House of Commons*.

I am also very proud to see that the motion is seconded by the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonnette, who was responsible last year for the brilliant and valiant work done on the Canada Labour Code, when he held the position I have this year. Consider-

ing the situation that prevailed last year, I feel I must thank and congratulate him.

Here we are with Group No. 7, which substantially represents our position with respect to this bill, and which refers in particular to the clause on replacement workers. It is of such importance that we cannot, in all conscience, support this bill with the present wording of clause 42.

So that our audience may understand this fully, I feel it is worthwhile reading in its entirety the position of the government, backed by the NDP, and I believe by the Progressive Conservative Party, while the Reform Party and the Bloc Québécois are opposed to clause 42, but for diametrically opposed reasons.

● (1600)

I will read clause 42 in its entirety.

No employer or person acting on behalf of an employer shall use, for the demonstrated purpose of undermining a trade union's representational capacity rather than the pursuit of legitimate bargaining objectives, the services of a person who was not an employee in the bargaining unit on the date on which notice to bargain collectively was given and was hired or assigned after that date to perform all or part of the duties of an employee in the bargaining unit on strike or locked out.

Members will have noted, as my colleague, the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, did last year, the convoluted wording, which is of no real help to anyone. It is a nightmare, not to put too fine a point on it, to get at the meaning of using for the demonstrated purpose of undermining a trade union's representational capacity rather than the pursuit of legitimate bargaining objectives. It sidesteps the issue, and this is one of the secondary reasons, in addition to the fact that we are opposed to the substance, that we are opposed to the way the problem is set out.

I do not think that Canada—compared with Quebec obviously—is equipping itself with the means to move forward. I think that everyone is going after a careful balance. This is worth pointing out, because the whole thrust of the Sims report is to achieve balance. I think the result is something that is going to balance everyone into a corner.

This is one of the reasons—and it is both secondary and essential at the same time—we oppose this clause and accordingly the entire bill.

It is rather interesting to note, as I did earlier, that the Liberal party, the government party, is in favour of the bill. It is understandable that the New Democratic party supports it, given its close ties with the union movement. The Progressive Conservative party is in favour, but the Bloc Québécois is not, nor is the Reform party, for diametrically opposed reasons.

The Royal Assent

It puts me in mind of Meech Lake, and this is part of the Canada-Quebec problem. The Bloc Québécois is against the bill because it does not give workers enough, and the Reform party is against it because it gives workers too much. It is so strongly opposed that it wants to eliminate every term that prevents the hiring of scabs or replacement workers.

With the Reform Party there is no subtlety. It even goes into the details where the board is given powers to declare the hiring of replacement workers when done out in the open an unfair labour practice, whereas here, with their balanced approach, the Liberals are claiming that replacement workers can be hired in order to undermine a union's representational capacity.

The Reform Party goes a long way. Should it appear that replacement workers are being hired to undermine the union's representational capacity, it wants to deny the board the right to declare the hiring of replacement workers unfair labour practice. That's that.

The Conservatives are after the same thing, but more subtly. Their approach is worth describing. The government has grown in wisdom and in thoughtfulness in the past year. It has added a very important word. Last year, the wording read "No employer or person acting on behalf of an employer shall use, thereby undermining a trade union's representational capacity—", while the 1998 version reads "—for the demonstrated purpose of undermining a trade union's representational capacity—".

THE ROYAL ASSENT

● (1605)

[*Translation*]

A message was delivered by the Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

● (1610)

[*English*]

And being returned:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate chamber the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

Bill S-4, an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act (maritime liability)—Chapter No. 6.

Government Orders

Bill S-5, an act to amend the Canada Evidence Act and the Criminal Code in respect of persons with disabilities, to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act in respect of persons with disabilities and other matters and to make consequential amendments to other Acts—Chapter No. 9.

Bill C-8, an act respecting an accord between the Governments of Canada and the Yukon Territory relating to the administration and control of and legislative jurisdiction in respect of oil and gas—Chapter No. 5.

Bill C-18, an act to amend the Customs Act and the Criminal Code—Chapter No. 7.

Bill C-17, an act to amend the Telecommunications Act and the Teleglobe Canada Reorganization and Divestiture Act—Chapter No. 8.

• (1615)

[Translation]

It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst, employment insurance; the hon. member for Vancouver East, the multilateral agreement on trade; the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River, disaster relief.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and of the motions in Group No. 7.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I was denouncing the fact that the government changed its position, rather subtly, without boasting too loudly about it, from one year to the next. In 1997, speaking of replacement workers, it read “for the purpose of undermining a trade union’s representational capacity”.

In 1998, obviously under pressure from management, the word “demonstrated” was added. It now reads “for the demonstrated purpose of undermining a trade union’s representational capacity”. This will make it much more difficult for the union to prove to the court that replacement workers were hired for the purpose of undermining its representational capacity.

The union will be required to prove the “demonstrated purpose of undermining”. The fact that replacement workers are being hired is not enough. Now it will have to be demonstrated that it was

“for the demonstrated” specific and actual “purpose of undermining the union’s representational capacity”.

This makes the union’s burden of proof even heavier, which is likely to have a negative impact on its members’ morale and discourage them from getting involved in this kind of thing.

The PC’s approach is even worse. I do not know whether it was inspired by its former leader, Jean Charest, the former member for Sherbrooke, but if that is the case, Quebec workers are in for a rough ride if Charest ever becomes the premier of Quebec.

Motion No. 27 moved by the Progressive Conservative Party reads as follows:

(2.2) For greater certainty, an employer shall be deemed not to have undermined a trade union’s representational capacity by reason only of the employer’s use of the services of a person referred to in subsection (2.1).

The Liberals are saying that it must be “for the demonstrated purpose”, while the Conservatives are basically saying that even though scabs are hired, the employer is not trying to adversely affect workers.

This is a big joke. They are laughing at workers. They do not care about their right to strike, about their demands. Both the Conservatives and the Reformers are trying to undermine the very existence of unions. This is most serious and this is why I cannot support the clause in its present form. One can see that workers’ rights are in jeopardy, given that the government—with just one additional word—and the Conservatives—with their proposed amendment—are making it a lot more difficult for unions to adequately protect themselves.

As for the Reform Party, it does not beat around the bush. For all practical purposes, the right to strike is completely undermined. With the Reformers, the issue is not the unions’ representational capacity, but the right to strike. Under the Reformers’ logic, even though workers are unionized and can democratically decide to go on strike, any employer could legally, with impunity, hire replacement workers to continue operations, and there would be nothing wrong with that. Under the Reformers’ plan, it would all be perfectly legal.

In no way are they saying that this is an unfair practice. Under the Reformers’ plan, even though the right to strike exists, even though a strike is legal, replacement workers could be hired with impunity.

• (1620)

We feel this is unacceptable, particularly to those of us in Quebec who have experienced something else, which we shall get back to at third reading. For the last 21 years, we have lived in a society where the right to strike is respected and where the hiring of scab labour is banned as an unfair labour practice. As a result, there are fewer strikes, they are not as long, and most importantly, there is no violence.

Government Orders

One need only go as far as Quebec City to see the difference. Recently there was violence at the port of Quebec, which is a federal jurisdiction, when there was a labour conflict and scabs were hired. The authorities intervened too late, unfortunately, to prevent the violence.

We are, therefore, totally opposed to this clause of the bill.

[*English*]

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I see there are several motions with respect to the replacement worker provision in Bill C-19. One motion is seeking to delete the provision while another is seeking to make the provision into a general prohibition on their use.

Bill C-19 implements the majority recommendation of the Sims task force with respect to replacement workers. The task force noted that the one point concerning replacement workers on which both labour and management agreed was that they should not be used by an employer for the purpose of ridding the workplace of union representation.

The task force majority did not recommend a general prohibition on the use of replacement workers. It did recommend that their demonstrated use for the purpose of undermining a union's representational capacity rather than the pursuit of legitimate bargaining objectives should be an unfair labour practice.

While maintaining their underlying opposing positions on the replacement worker issue, representatives of both labour and management in the federal sector accepted this approach in the context of the overall package of task force recommendations.

In response to concerns raised during the study of former Bill C-66, that the wording of the provision did not capture the full intent of the task force recommendation, the provision in Bill C-19 was redrafted to include the complete wording of the task force recommendation. The new wording was requested by employer representatives as well as by the Senate standing committee in its report on Bill C-66. The added words make it clear that the union filing the complaint bears the burden of proof and that the use of replacement workers by an employer for the purpose of continuing operations is not prohibited.

With respect of the new wording of the provision, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce told the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of with Persons with Disabilities that the addition of the words "rather than the pursuit of legitimate bargaining objectives" in proposed section 94(2.1) will ensure that any tribunal interpreting this legislation will be guided by the explicit obligation to consider the reason why the employer may have hired strike replacements rather than only the

protection of a union's representational rights, as was the case under Bill C-66.

The chair of the federally regulated employers transportation and communications group told the committee: "The language we see in Bill C-19 is reflective of the spirit, intent and content of the Sims report in most of the critical areas". FETCO legal counsel stated that the drafting concern they had with former Bill C-66, including the replacement worker provision, had been addressed. In my view, given these comments, additional language would be redundant.

Bill C-19 includes a number of other provisions recommended by the task force which will protect the rights of employees who strike or are locked out.

Bill C-19 confirms the right of striking or locked out employees to return to work at the end of a work stoppage in preference to replacements. It gives employees dismissed or disciplined during a work stoppage access to grievance arbitration. It prohibits the submission of an application for certification or revocation during work stoppages without the consent of the board. It says replacement workers are not entitled to participate in representation votes. It recognizes the right of employees on strike or who are locked out to continue to be covered by insurance plans provided they pay the full amount of required contributions.

• (1625)

The Bloc Quebecois has put forward a motion to add a paragraph to proposed section 87(4). This motion would prohibit the use of replacement workers where employees of the bargaining unit continue the activities necessary to prevent immediate and serious danger to the safety or health of the public. I submit this is likely to generate unnecessary litigation.

The proposed amendment sees a somewhat bizarre situation in which an employer seeks not only to have services maintained by bargaining unit employees but to recruit replacements to work alongside of them. Add to this unusual circumstance a trade union ready to negotiate the maintenance of services by its own members and to accept that they will be working with replacements doing bargaining unit work; in all, an eventuality which is, to say the least, very unlikely.

The provisions in Bill C-19 respecting the use of replacement workers represent a fair and reasonable compromise to a difficult issue. I urge members of the House to support the provisions in Bill C-19 without amendment.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are debating Group No. 7. I want to talk a bit about replacement worker legislation.

While this legislation does not come out with an outright ban on the use of replacement workers, it does leave, to say the least, a lot

Government Orders

of discretion up to the CIRB. It begs probably more questions than it actually answers.

The discretion of whether to use replacement workers is going to be left solely to the board. In any case of the use of replacement workers there will be tremendous pressure put on the board to agree with the union that this is an undermining of the union, which is referred to in the vernacular as union busting.

It is likely that, under tremendous pressure, the use of any replacement workers, whether managerial or otherwise, will be seen by the board as undermining the fundamentals of the union.

We have read quotes by several union leaders which say exactly that. They say they are going to impress on the board in every instance where replacement workers are used that it will be solely to undermine the union.

I think there are instances where replacement workers will simply be used to maintain the viability of the business. I do not think there is a union in the world that would like to have its employer broke. It would be basically cutting off its nose to spite its face.

In the area of replacement workers, we are also told by union bosses that this is absolutely necessary to prevent violence. It seems as if we are under some kind of constant threat. If there is not an outright ban on replacement workers there may be violence. The unions are quick to cite examples of where there was violence on the picket lines. Violence is one thing but good labour legislation is another thing. There are laws which state that violence is not acceptable and having to pass labour laws under the veil of possible violence is doing it for the wrong reasons.

• (1630)

In the course of the debate today we heard how naive some members in this House thought members of the Reform Party were because we made allusions to protecting the national economy from devastating work stoppages that would have an effect on the national economy. A rather weak argument was put forth that of course any disruption of services is going to put economic pressure on somebody. Certainly. Of course. We understand that the union wants to put economic pressure on the employer in order for the employer to see the union's way of thinking.

Apparently, the people who made those comments had selective hearing. We were talking about actions taken by employers and employees, strikes or lockouts, that would have a devastating effect on the national economy. A devastating effect on the national economy filters down very quickly to the very people my colleagues down the way are purporting to protect. If there is a work stoppage of any type that has a tremendously adverse effect on the economy, it is the little people who support those businesses and who depend on those services who are ultimately hurt.

I will deliberately shorten my comments because some of my colleagues would like to share their thoughts on the use and partial bans of replacement workers.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this set of motions in Group No. 7 is a bit of a quandary for us. There are two motions which the NDP caucus is in favour of and others that we are not. I presume we will have the opportunity to vote on them individually.

The two motions we are in favour of deal with strengthening the anti-scab aspects of Bill C-19. We have spoken in favour of Bill C-19 in total. We recognize its value and we recognize the long and exhaustive consultative process it took to get us to this point. However our one criticism of Bill C-19 has always been and still is that the reference to anti-scab is too soft and does not really follow through to the degree—

Mr. Jean Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I notice that presently we do not have quorum to continue debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We have a quorum call. Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We have quorum.

Mr. Pat Martin: Mr. Speaker, I really hope the 130,000 prairie farmers who are waiting for this bill to be passed so that they can be comfortable that their grain will move without interruption this fall are taking note of the delays and the stalling tactics that have been going on in this House. I hope they are paying attention. I am sure they are. They will make good note of that.

• (1635)

What I was getting at and the reason I rose to speak is that while we are happy with the package in total, our one criticism of Bill C-19 is that the anti-scab aspects of the bill do not go far enough to really fulfill what the parties had in mind when they sat down to draft Bill C-19.

We understand that the whole package was a compromise. Nobody at the table really got everything they wanted. There was a lot of give and take and a lot of goodwill. Finding a balance is never easy, but having reviewed the motions we have before us from the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, I believe Motion Nos. 19 and 26 would serve the bill well in making it the piece of legislation Canadian industry really needs and should be asking for.

The virtues of anti-scab legislation are obvious. We have the case study right in the province next to us. We can look to the province of Quebec and monitor the experience and the benefits from its long tenure of the anti-scab bill. We know from that experience there are fewer days of lost time due to strikes and

Government Orders

lockouts. The parties are not likely to risk pushing a bargaining session to an impasse knowing that their anti-scab legislation would preclude the ability of using replacement workers. Naturally the parties are forced to a position where they have to work a little harder to find a reasonable solution.

We also know that the incidence of picket line violence is lower. I agree with the previous speaker that we should not be charting our course by the lighting on a passing ship. What I mean to say is that we should not be crafting legislation to preclude violence. Nobody is going to be drafting legislation under threat or some veiled threat. That is not the case. The actual fact is that both parties often allow tempers to flare and incidents of violence do take place on picket lines when scabs try to cross picket lines. If that is precluded or eliminated, then there is not that problem.

I have been to the scene of strikes in the city of Montreal. I joined my fellow brothers with the carpenters union when they were striking in that industry in the city of Montreal. The first thing I did was I went to a major site where I knew there were carpenters working. I wanted to join them on the picket line, not really thinking through that there was not going to be a picket line. There did not need to be a picket line.

Picket lines are there to keep scabs out. Once it has been shown that there is a strike, a couple of placards are put up and the public knows there is a strike at the site and the product is hot as a result. There are no scabs crossing the line. There is no need for workers to be walking the line keeping vehicles from going in and out, et cetera. That is where things flare up.

Just the very fact that there is solid anti-scab legislation in the province of Quebec minimizes the number of days lost due to strikes and lockouts. It minimizes the incidents of people stooping to violence on either side, whether it is the replacement workers or frustrated employees at the location trying to defend their jobs.

Another aspect of Bill C-19 deals with anti-scab and I believe it needs to be improved. The burden of proof is currently on the union to demonstrate that the employer is using scabs in a way that undermines the bargaining rights of the union, or it is the intent to undermine the union by the use of scabs. Regarding that burden of proof, contrary to what we heard from the previous speaker, it is going to be very difficult to get any board to rule as to what was in the mind of the employer when the scabs were hired.

The advantage is clearly to the employer in the current language of Bill C-19 if it is not amended. I would certainly argue that it does not matter what labour leaders were quoted, obviously the advocates for the employees are going to argue that the union is trying to undermine the bargaining rights and that therefore the scabs should be outlawed. I frankly do not think that they would win. It would be a terrible uphill battle and a very difficult argument to win. The

Reform Party should take some comfort in that. The way I read Bill C-19 on that aspect, the advantage is clearly for the employer.

● (1640)

This is one of the most sensitive parts of Bill C-19 for our caucus at least and for the labour movement. The right to withhold services in a way that puts economic pressure on the employer is the only peaceful means of negotiating benefits for workers that is available to us. It is really the only tool in our tool chest. When bargaining breaks down and we are trying to elevate the standards or the wages and working conditions for the people we represent, passive resistance and withholding service are the two things we can legally use to add weight to our points of view.

As a result, these clauses and the motions put forward by the member for Trois-Rivières are very important to us. They would add that small bit which is lacking in Bill C-19 to make it a truly satisfactory package that will add lasting labour peace to the Canadian industrial relations environment.

The whole idea of strikes and lockouts may get more attention than it deserves in these debates. It has been stated over and over again that over 95% of all rounds of bargaining are settled without any lost time. While lost time due to strikes and lockouts is a problem in the industry, it is dealt with in a way that is out of proportion.

In Manitoba we lose approximately 50,000 person days per year due to strikes and lockouts which is a big problem. Management howls about productivity and lost profits, et cetera. It is a problem. However we lose 550,000 person days per year due to injuries on the job and workplace accidents. If they are serious about lost productivity, the answer is to clean up the workplace, to stop the carnage in the workplace. Then those 50,000 person days lost per year will be put into perspective.

Another aspect deals with picket line incidents. One of the positive aspects of Bill C-19 is that employees who are off work for a strike or a lockout will be guaranteed their jobs when they go back. Those who may have been disciplined during their absence will have the right to the grievance procedure and arbitration. This is a case of natural justice. They should have access to some avenue of recourse. If in the heat of the moment an incident happens, this provision in Bill C-19 will recognize that everybody deserves the right to the use of that avenue of recourse.

Our caucus will be voting in favour of Motions Nos. 19 and 26. We believe they are necessary and that they will add substance and weight to what is already a worthy piece of legislation. In the interests of minimizing the lost time due to strikes and lockouts, I would hope the other members in the House can support the motions put forward by the member for Trois-Rivières.

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the remarks of my colleagues from the Bloc Québécois, the Reform Party and the New Democratic Party. If we were to follow the policy described by my hon. colleague from the NDP, unemployment and poverty would be much higher in Canada, because I can assure you that many more industries would be closing down.

I also listened to the comments made by the hon. member from the Bloc Québécois, who addressed the rights of workers. We in the Conservative Party believe in the rights of workers and we have shown it.

We want to make sure these workers do not lose their jobs. We believe in dialogue rather than in steamrolling people.

• (1645)

[English]

One of the big problems in what we are dealing with today is the replacement workers part of it. This issue is one of the few on which the authors of the Sims report could not agree.

One of its authors argued in favour of a complete ban on the use of replacement workers as is the case in labour legislation in Quebec and British Columbia. The majority of the Sims report argued against a general ban on the use of replacement workers. It states where the use of replacement workers is in dispute and is demonstrated to be for the purpose of undermining the union's representative capacity rather than pursuing a legitimate bargaining objective it should be declared an unfair labour practice. There was a lot of confusion when it came to this part and I believe there still is.

Many motions are before us today and we will probably be here late tonight voting on them. When there are many motions on a piece of legislation it means there are many questions about the proposed legislation. We have not dealt with this legislation in approximately 25 years and all of a sudden it is being put through the House.

Let me explain what is happening. Let me take a bit of time to explain to our viewing audience and the people in the gallery what has happened today and what the government has imposed on this piece of legislation, on the House of Commons and on the public.

Once again the government is in a rush to get it out of here. It has invoked time allocation on the bill. That means it has cut off debate.

It was in committee. I agree; I was there. A lot of consultation went on and we heard from a lot of witnesses. We now have a chance to debate the legislation in front of Canadians. When it

comes to that the government cuts us off. It is unfortunate but is what happened today.

The government mentions consultation. Yes, it did that but it certainly did not listen. There are probably 50 amendments today and I do not believe very many of them will pass. These are the concerns of Canadians but they do not seem to be what the government thinks.

Before Bill C-19 there was Bill C-66 which contained provisions that were deemed to tilt the balance toward the unions. The bill did not stipulate clearly that there was no ban on the use of replacement workers. Instead it stated that no employer or person shall use the services of a replacement worker for the purpose of undermining a trade unions replacement representational capacity.

During Senate hearings no one seemed to know how the terms of the bill would be interpreted. That is still a problem today. We do not seem to know what the interpretation will be.

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Jean Dubé: My hon. colleague on the government side seems to have all the answers, but I am sure we will have problems with it.

[Translation]

Motion No. 19 in Group No. 7, moved by the Bloc Québécois, prohibits the use of replacement workers as long as the workers agree to perform the duties necessary to maintain the essential services referred to in subsection (1).

For example, during a postal strike, as long as postal workers agreed to deliver government cheques, Canada Post would not be allowed to hire replacement workers to perform these duties. That is what is proposed in the Bloc's motion.

We in the Conservative Party must vote against this motion. With this amendment, what cannot be done through the front door is done through the back door. Quite simply, we are against banning replacement workers.

Motion No. 25 put forward by the Reform Party deletes the clause on replacement workers altogether. We in the Conservative Party will vote for this motion.

• (1650)

We have an amendment that seeks to clarify this clause and to make its interpretation less ambiguous. If our changes are rejected, it would be better to completely eliminate the clause, so as to avoid any ambiguity that might give the board the power not to allow the use of replacement workers.

While Motion No. 26 proposed by the Bloc Québécois seeks to completely prohibit the hiring of replacement workers, our amendment strikes a balance. Indeed, it is not reasonable to prohibit the use of replacement workers, because it would jeopardize the very existence of a business. What is the point of going on strike, if the

Government Orders

business no longer exists at the conclusion of the negotiation process? Replacement workers must be available to provide the essential services that workers will not provide.

Our amendment, Motion No. 27, better reflects the spirit of the Simms report. It clearly states that replacement workers are not hired for the purpose of undermining a trade union's representational capacity. The motion is clear, and if it is passed, there will definitely not be many questions. But I am sure that this evening, the government will vote against it. The motion is too clear for the government, which prefers a bit of confusion.

Motion No. 29 is proposed by the Reform Party. Motion No. 25 seeks to completely eliminate the clause on the use of replacement workers. If Motion No. 25 is passed, that clause will have to be deleted as well.

There are many motions before us today, and we think it is possible to make the bill fair. However, the government must listen to Canadians and to all the opposition parties which have made good suggestions, whether it is the Reform Party, the Bloc Quebecois or our own party. I wonder about the New Democratic Party, if you follow me. We have an opportunity to do a good job.

[English]

While the new formulation comes closer to what the Sims task force on Bill C-19 had in mind, it is our opinion that it is still not made clear enough. This is not a general ban on the use of replacement workers. More important, it still does not properly address the meaning of the words used.

Mr. Jim Gouk: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I will say right at the start so that it does not get a scurry going that this is not a quorum call.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you hear me out on this issue because I am saying it in all sincerity. Given that opposition members would like as much time as possible to raise points on debate on the various amendments, some of which we may not even be able to get to, and given that the government would like to limit the time available for debate, I ask if it would be willing to yield the floor to opposition members. There is little time left and there is a whole group we have not been able to debate yet.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain: I rise on the same point of order. Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. The reality is that we had a whole day of debate last week in which members of the Reform Party refused to even discuss these motions. We have been in committee. They filibustered. Absolutely not.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for West Kootenay—Okanagan has asked for unanimous consent that the government yield to the opposition.

Does the government give unanimous consent to yield to the opposition for the time remaining in debate?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (1655)

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Oak Ridges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to my colleagues across the way and I am dismayed to hear about the fact that suddenly we have invoked time allocation.

I ask hon. members across the way where they were during the discussions on Bill C-19. I would like to know where they were during the course of the filibuster when we had members of the official opposition obviously needing to go back to labour code 101 to understand the basics. It was very disappointing to see that of the 97 clauses there were nine amendments proposed by the official opposition, seven on clause 2.

On the road to Damascus they suddenly discovered the light. They discovered all sorts of new amendments. Where were they during the course of the debate that I participated in? I understand that members of the New Democratic Party were there. Unfortunately the Conservatives were not there during the filibuster. To suggest that the government is trying to bring in closure on this important bill is absolutely ludicrous.

Dealing with the substance of the amendments before us, the approach in Bill C-19 is a very careful compromise on a very difficult issue. We recognize an employer's right to hire replacement workers for legitimate purposes. However, their use for the purpose of ridding the workplace of union representation would be unfair labour practice. This was the recommendation of the majority.

My colleague opposite talks about the fact that it was not unanimous, but the majority of the members of the Sims task force supported it. It was part of the overall package of recommendations which both labour and management considered acceptable.

Motions have been put forward which would radically alter this provision and therefore upset the overall balance of the proposed amendments we are trying to achieve. One motion calls for a general prohibition of the use of replacement workers. Another motion seeks to eliminate any restriction on their use. Still another motion seeks to add additional wording.

This provision was carefully examined during the parliamentary study of former Bill C-66. Again I hear that we are trying to rush the legislation through. Bill C-66 died when the election was called. We have been told time after time that this is an improvement on Bill C-66. If we are rushing the bill, I would like to know where the opposition was.

Some employer groups raised concerns about the wording of the provision in the former Bill C-66. They wanted the full text of the

Government Orders

task force recommendations to be included. This was also the recommendation of the Senate committee which also studied the former Bill C-66.

What did the government do? The Minister of Labour responded to these concerns and changed the wording of the replacement worker provision in Bill C-19 to fully reflect the task force recommendation. To repeat that for the opposition, to make sure that the replacement worker provision was fully implemented the task force recommendation was put into the bill. Major federally regulated employers who appeared before the House committee during the study of the bill indicated that they were satisfied with the new wording. If members of the opposition were there they certainly would have heard that.

To those who wish to eliminate the provision I say there must be an appropriate remedy when an employer hires a replacement worker and then refuses to bargain in good faith. This provision provides in my view and certainly in the view of the government such a remedy.

When the television cameras are on we now get all the amendments. Obviously we need to have television cameras on all the time in committee and then maybe we would have some serious work done.

To those who want to prohibit the use of replacement workers a total ban on replacements would undermine the balance. The bill is trying to achieve a balance.

Finally to those who think more wording is needed I refer them to the position of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce.

• (1700)

Maintaining its objection to the rationale for amending the code to include such a provision, the chamber representative told the standing committee:

We are pleased that the federal government heeded our concerns with respect to the earlier wording of this provision and is proposing to amend the legislation accordingly. In particular, the addition of the words "rather than the pursuit of legitimate bargaining objectives" in proposed subsection 94(2.1) will ensure that any tribunal interpreting this legislation will be guided by the explicit obligation to consider the reason why the employer may have hired strike replacements rather than only the protection of a union's representation rights, as was the case under Bill C-66.

It is my view that the provisions that have been put forward in terms of the amendments be voted down.

Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious to speak after listening to all that claptrap and baffle-gab by the Liberal member who just spoke.

This is garbage about how we need television cameras in the committee room because then serious work will get done. We need something in the committee room so something serious gets done, but it is not TV cameras. It is the replacement of the majority of

the people in there who act according to what the whip tells them. I have seen the whip's department in there watching how they vote on certain occasions to make sure they toe the party line.

In fact, one time they made a mistake in the transport committee. They actually had a Reform amendment that the hierarchy of the Liberal Party did not like, but it passed because there were a couple of Liberals who did not have their marching orders and consequently they voted according to what made sense instead of the directives of the Liberal hierarchy.

We came into this place at report stage and the Liberals made an amendment that changed the one that passed in committee. So much for the garbage spewed by the last speaker that we have to do things in committee where things are treated seriously.

As far as this business of replacement workers, it is really unfortunate that debate on this is going to be cut short. They say it should all be done in committee.

In committee we have three members. In this House we have 59. Basically they are denying 56 members the right to have a voice, to speak according to their constituents, to people they have consulted and according to their own beliefs. That is unacceptable. It is shameful.

They talk about democracy. They should not utter that word. It should not be coming out of their mouths.

Where I have a problem with the whole concept of replacement workers is that this act talks about who can decide when replacement workers can be used and when they cannot. The problem is where in here does it define exactly what a replacement worker is.

If you are working in a mill, operating a particular machine, and you go on strike and the company simply hires a different operator for that machine, that is a replacement worker. Frankly, I do not agree with that. Some of my colleagues may not happen to agree with me. That is fine. I think that is a replacement worker and I do not think that aspect of it should be allowed.

If on the other hand the company is owned by a particular individual and his wife and their business partner and they are able to keep that plant operating, then I think it is their right. It is their plant. Who are we or the labour relations board or anyone else to tell them they cannot run their own business? If there is a contract involved, they have to honour the obligations of that contract.

This allows the CIRB to actually make a decision. If the owner of the company does something and the union says that is taking away its powers because they are still making some money, the board says it will just shut them down. That is the power that this thing gives.

There is a bigger problem. The bigger problem is strikes. If there were no strikes, in a utopian world, we would not be arguing here today about whether there should be replacement workers. In a better world everybody would have a job. Everybody would be

Government Orders

treated fairly. Negotiations would go smoothly. That would be just great. Unfortunately this is not a perfect world.

It might be a little more perfect if the other side would give us more time to discuss the possibilities and some of the things that might happen, but we get into this confrontational role and it does not want to hear other ideas. It is like the old adage, do not confuse me with the facts, my mind is already made up. I see them sitting laughing over there. I think it is great, at least somebody is in here to laugh. That is rare.

• (1705)

As far as whether replacement worker definition should be amended better, one of the things that is really sad about the death of democracy caused by the other side's vote this morning to restrict the debate is that we are not even going to get to Group No. 8. Group No. 8 would deal with something that would resolve the problem of replacement workers. Group No. 8 deals with an alternative to a strike. Would it not be wonderful if we could find a reasonable alternative to a strike?

We had the post office situation. This is something the Liberals should really appreciate because they just went through this. We had last year our fourth postal strike in ten years. Four times in the last ten years the governments of this country have allowed the post office, which is a monopoly, to shut down the mail service of this country. Each time the government says this is terrible, this is devastating, so it orders postal workers back to work.

It compounded the mistake with another mistake. The first mistake was to say "you can strike and restrict everybody and deprive them of their ability to have a mail service even though we have set it up so that there is only one possible alternative for you anyway to use the mail". Then recognizing it made a mistake it made a second mistake by ordering postal workers back to work but not putting into place an alternative to going out on strike in the first place. Why should we be surprised if year after year, strike after strike we find ourselves right back in the same situation?

To make a mistake the first time I can understand. But when the same mistake is made over and over again then we have to start questioning the relative wisdom of the group that is making the mistake. The Liberal Party has certainly made that with the post office.

Now we have a potential strike of the air traffic system. I hope it does not go any further. For years that could not happen, but now they have been cut loose.

I tried in transport to get a provision put in that would provide an alternative to a strike-lockout dispute settlement mechanism. The vehicle we wanted to use was final offer arbitration. But the government in its wisdom chose not to do that.

Now we find ourselves in Bill C-19 arguing about replacement workers. Of course the government is going to be right back into that. It came up with the replacement worker concept for the air traffic controllers which basically put them in a situation where they could go on strike but when they were on strike everything carried on the same as always. So what does this do for the collective bargaining system the government claims it cherishes so much? It does not cherish it at all.

When we talk in terms of strikes, we do not talk about who wins and loses, because the winner is the person who loses the least. What is it going to take for the government to wake up? I am glad to see some of the Liberals are coming to their senses, coming over to the right side. I hope in doing that their minds change as well as their position, because if that happens we would make some progress in this place.

When there is a strike, and we do not even talk about replacement workers, we have a company that is deprived of their revenues, we have workers who are deprived of their income and we have all the supplemental collateral damage that is done to people all over other areas. Instead of talking about replacement workers, maybe we should be talking about replacing the dispute settlement mechanism in the labour code so that we actually have something that means Canadians will be able to keep their jobs and there will be a reasonable, viable alternative to going out on strike.

Going on strike or locking people out, if it happens to be the employer who initiates the labour disruption, is kind of like a duel where both sides shoot at one another.

I see I am even getting the victory sign from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour. I really like that. I think she finally realizes the error of her ways in the past and now she is actually ready to listen.

• (1710)

If nothing else happens out of all this debate, if we can get through to one poor soul on that side, then perhaps this will have been worth it.

The whole concept of replacement workers is wrong. We are approaching it from who decides when they can have them. The approach that should have been taken is what are replacement workers. The CIRB decides what hurts, what is okay, what is not, maybe it will flip a coin in the event of a strike. We cannot go tipping the scales by saying it is okay to change the formula for one side and not the other. I hate even to admit there is the possibility of a strike. We have to recognize we have a bigger problem and begin dealing with it with things like final offer arbitration.

However, as long as we are stuck in this system we need some kind of mechanism which states what constitutes a replacement worker. As long as the company is not using that type of person it is free to take those types of actions. Where we have someone who is clearly defined as a replacement worker there is no decision to make. It is black and white. They are not allowed to be used.

Government Orders

It is really unfortunate that we are dealing with an opposition of minds instead of dealing with solutions. We are in this confrontational position and unfortunately, because of the actions of the Liberal government today, the last and perhaps most important group, finding an alternative dispute settlement mechanism, will not even get debated. That is a shame.

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that in a few minutes we are going to be voting. We have something like 47 votes to go through so this is sort of the end of debate before closure. Closure happened 14 times in the 12 years when we had a Liberal government under Pierre Elliott Trudeau and we thought he was arrogant. This government has more than doubled that already.

I have talked on this bill at second reading and on Groups Nos. 1, 2, 6 and now 7. Group No. 7 deals with replacement workers. If there is one item where we can listen to rhetorical comment, polarized comment, entrenched comment, confrontational comment, unenlightened comment, blind comment or comment coloured by experiences, this is the one area of the bill where we are going to hear all that. We do not need that.

What we need is a vision that does not look at the past and does not lead us into poor management and poor union leadership where workers very often tend to come last. That is not what we need. We all know how bad it can get. We can count the ways very readily. We had the example that is often referred to with the Royal Oak mine in the north where we had replacement workers brought in. People lost their lives in an underground bombing over an issue.

At the other end of the scale we have small businesses with certification whereby the total business would be at risk just from a short targeted strike on that business. We need to balance all that. It is an important issue. It should be addressed in the collective agreement and if the agreement is suspended, which often occurs, both parties will agree to live up to their end of this bargain on replacement workers.

What we do not need is the CIRB to be put in the untenable position which this bill does of being able to prohibit the use of replacement workers if the CIRB determines their presence undermines the union. The CIRB should never be placed in that position.

• (1715)

Mr. Speaker, I notice you are signalling that my time is up. That is unfortunate because I had so much worthy material to present. I did not even get to the bottom line of my speech. However, I do appreciate the fact that you have given me this opportunity to exit. I look forward to the upcoming votes.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It being 5.15 p.m., pursuant to the order made earlier this day, it is my duty to interrupt

the proceedings and put forthwith all questions necessary to dispose of report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 19. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 19 stands deferred.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 25. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 25 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 29.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 26. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 26 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The next question is on Group No. 8, Motion No. 21.

Mr. Jim Gouk: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to ask your advice. Is there any procedure available to us to deal with the fact that we are about to vote on a number of things in this House on which there has not been one single word of debate?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for West Kootenay—Okanagan is aware that a motion for time allocation was given with proper notice earlier in the week. A vote was taken. According to the standing orders of the House of Commons, it is quite appropriate to proceed in this way. That is all I will say on that point of order.

• (1720)

We are now introducing Group No. 8, Motions Nos. 21 and 24.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing line 18 on page 30 with the following:

“the trade union, direct that final offer selection arbitration be used as a method of”

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-19, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing line 41 on page 31 with the following:

“make an order directing the parties to adopt final offer selection arbitration as a method of resolving the issues in dispute between the parties for the purpose of ensuring the settlement of the dispute to”

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We will now put the question on Motion No. 21. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): A recorded division on Motion No. 21 stands deferred.

We will now put the question on Motion No. 24. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): A recorded division on Motion No. 24 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-19, in Clause 68, be amended by adding after line 26 on page 42 the following:

“(1.1) The report laid before Parliament pursuant to subsection (1) stands permanently referred to the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to human resources development.”

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The recorded division on Motion No. 31 stands deferred.

[English]

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of the bill. Call in the members.

• (1745)

After the ringing of the bells:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The question is on Motion No. 1 at the report stage of Bill C-19.

• (1750)

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

(Division No. 138)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bigras	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brisson
Cadman	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye	Debien
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Hart
Harvey	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lefebvre
Loubier	Lowther
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Manning	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Nunziata	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Plamondon	Power
Price	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vellacott
Venne	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	White (North Vancouver) —100

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Massé	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Perric
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanelief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcyia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—152

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 2.

• (1755)

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Before we proceed to Motion No. 2, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote just taken to Motion Nos. 5, 7 and 31.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 138*]

The Speaker: Therefore I declare Motions Nos. 5, 7 and 31 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House would agree I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I am checking closely but I am sure the Reform Party is voting nay to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, we support this, one of our own motions.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party will vote against this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: I will be voting yes to this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Brien
Crête
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis)
Dumas
Gauthier
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne —37

Abbott
Adams
Anders
Assad
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brisson
Bryden
Byrne
Cadman
Cannis
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Coderre
Collenette
Coppes
Cummins
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Easter
Elley
Finestone
Folco
Forseth
Gagliano
Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Harb
Harvard
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings

Government Orders

(Division No. 139)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bigras
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Duceppe
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guimond
Laurin
Lefebvre
Marceau
Ménard
Nunziata
Rocheleau
St-Hilaire
Turp

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anderson
Assadourian
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Calder
Caplan
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Epp
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Hart
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston

Government Orders

Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Lincoln
Longfield	Lowther
Lunn	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manning	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	Obhrai
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Pankiw	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Power	Pratt
Price	Proud
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Reynolds	Richardson
Riis	Ritz
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Stoffer
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Charlotte)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vautour	Vellacott
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylycia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Wood—215	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 3.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following items: Motions Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I will support Motions Nos. 10 and 11. With respect to the remaining motions I will vote as I voted on the original motion.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 139]

• (1800)

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 defeated.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following items: Motion No. 6 and Motion No. 8.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on Motion No. 6 I would like to be recorded in the affirmative as voting for the motion. With respect to Motion No. 8, I would oppose that motion.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 139.]

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 142)

YEAS**Members**

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bigras
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Dalphonso-Guiral
de Savoye	Debien
Dubé (Lévis)	Duceppe
Dumas	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Guay	Guimond
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lefebvre
Loubier	Marceau
Marchand	Ménard
Mercier	Plamondon
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
St-Hilaire	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp—35	

NAYS**Members**

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
 Baker
 Barnes
 Bélair
 Bellemare
 Bertrand
 Blaikie
 Bonwick
 Bradshaw
 Brison
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Cadman
 Cannis
 Carroll
 Casson
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chatters
 Coderre
 Collette
 Copps
 Cummins
 Desjarlais
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Doyle
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Duncan
 Easter
 Elley
 Finestone
 Folco
 Forseth
 Gagliano
 Gilmour
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Gouk
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Grose
 Harb
 Harvard
 Hill (MacLeod)
 Hilstrom
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Jennings
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
 Keyes
 Knutson
 Lastewka
 Lee
 Lill
 Longfield
 Lunn
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Maloney
 Manning
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 Matthews
 McDonough
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McTeague
 Meredith
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Mitchell
 Muise
 Myers
 Nunziata
 Obhrai
 Pagtakhan
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peric
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Pratt

Bailey
 Bakopanos
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bevilacqua
 Bonin
 Boudria
 Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
 Brown
 Bulte
 Caccia
 Calder
 Caplan
 Casey
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Clouthier
 Cohen
 Comuzzi
 Cullen
 Davies
 DeVillers
 Dion
 Dockrill
 Dromisky
 Duhamel
 Earle
 Eggleton
 Epp
 Finlay
 Fontana
 Fry
 Gallaway
 Godfrey
 Goodale
 Graham
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Guarnieri
 Hart
 Harvey
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hoepfner
 Ianno
 Jaffer
 Johnston
 Jordan
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kerpan
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Konrad
 Lavigne
 Leung
 Lincoln
 Lowther
 MacAulay
 Malhi
 Mancini
 Marleau
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Massé
 McCormick
 McGuire
 McNally
 McWhinney
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Minna
 Morrison
 Murray
 Nault
 Nystrom
 O'Reilly
 Pankiw
 Parrish
 Penson
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Kent—Essex)
 Power
 Price

Proud
 Ramsay
 Reed
 Richardson
 Ritz
 Robinson
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 Speller
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Stoffer
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Vellacott
 Wappel
 Wayne
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)
 Wilfert

Provenzano
 Redman
 Reynolds
 Riis
 Robillard
 Rock
 Schmidt
 Scott (Skeena)
 Serré
 Solberg
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Julien
 Strahl
 Telegdi
 Thompson (Charlotte)
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Vautour
 Volpe
 Wasylcia-Leis
 Whelan
 White (North Vancouver)
 Wood—216

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Drouin
Canuel	Godin (Châteauguay)
Fournier	O'Brien (Labrador)
Marchi	Peterson
Perron	Saada
Picard (Drummond)	
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 6 and 8 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 3.

[Translation]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that the members who are recorded as having voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[English]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois, with the exception of the member for Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, who had to leave, are in favour of the motion.

[English]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democratic Party members vote no to this motion.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yes to this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 140)

YEAS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bigras	Brien
Brison	Casey
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye
Debien	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Guay
Guimond	Harvey
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lefebvre
Loubier	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Marchand
Matthews	Ménard
Mercier	Muise
Plamondon	Power
Price	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Thompson (Charlotte)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Wayne —50

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Cloutier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cummins
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dockrill	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Finestone

Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Gilmour
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Hart	Harvard
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoeppner
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Lincoln
Longfield	Lowther
Lunn	MacAulay
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manning
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Massé	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Pankiw	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Reynolds	Richardson
Riis	Ritz
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Stoffer
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Vellacott	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Wood —201	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 4.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House would agree, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: We are voting on Motion No. 4. Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

• (1805)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois support this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats present vote no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party will vote against this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, as I understand this amendment it allows the board to vote for a chair should the position become vacant. I would support that motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 141*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bailey
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman
Chatters
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Gouk

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bigras
Brien
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
de Savoye
Dubé (Lévis)
Dumas
Elley
Forsyth
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Grey (Edmonton North)

Guay
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Kerpan
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Lunn
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Obhrai
Penson
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
St-Hilaire
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Guimond
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Konrad
Laurin
Lefebvre
Lowther
Manning
Marchand
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Pankiw
Plamondon
Reynolds
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vellacott
White (North Vancouver) — 84

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anderson
Assadourian
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Collenette
Copps
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)

Alcock
Assad
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Casey
Cauchon
Chan
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Earle
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Knutson
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
MacAulay
Malhi
Mancini
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé

Government Orders

Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Pratt	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Charlotte)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—167	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 30.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, you will find there is unanimous consent that those members who have voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with the Liberal members voting no.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will oppose this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats present vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party will vote in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this motion would preclude automatic certification. I would vote in support.

(The House divided on Motion No. 30, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 143*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brisson	Cadman
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hart
Harvey	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Matthews
McNally	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nunziata
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Power
Price	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Strahl
Thompson (Charlotte)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vellacott	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	White (North Vancouver)—64

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blaikie
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia

Calder
 Caplan
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Clouthier
 Cohen
 Comuzzi
 Crête
 Dalphond-Guiral
 de Savoye
 Desjarlais
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Dromisky
 Duceppe
 Dumas
 Easter
 Finestone
 Folco
 Fry
 Gagnon
 Gauthier
 Godfrey
 Goodale
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Guarnieri
 Guimond
 Harvard
 Ianno
 Jennings
 Karetak-Lindell
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Lalonde
 Laurin
 Lebel
 Lefebvre
 Lill
 Longfield
 MacAulay
 Maloney
 Marceau
 Marleau
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 McCormick
 McGuire
 McTeague
 Ménard
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Myers
 Nystrom
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish
 Peric
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Pratt
 Provenzano
 Reed
 Riis
 Robinson
 Rock
 Sauvageau
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Hilaire
 Stoffer
 Telegdi
 Torsney
 Turp
 Valeri
 Vautour
 Wappel
 Whelan
 Wood—187

Cannis
 Carroll
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Coderre
 Collette
 Copps
 Cullen
 Davies
 Debieu
 De Villers
 Dion
 Dockrill
 Dubé (Lévis)
 Duhamel
 Earle
 Eggleton
 Finlay
 Fontana
 Gagliano
 Gallaway
 Girard-Bujold
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Graham
 Grose
 Guay
 Harb
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Jordan
 Keyes
 Knutson
 Lastewka
 Lavigne
 Lee
 Leung
 Lincoln
 Loubier
 Malhi
 Mancini
 Marchand
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Massé
 McDonough
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McWhinney
 Mercier
 Minna
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Patry
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Kent—Essex)
 Plamondon
 Proud
 Redman
 Richardson
 Robillard
 Rocheleau
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Serré
 Speller
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 St-Julien
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Volpe
 Wasylcia-Leis
 Wilfert

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 30 lost.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following items: Motions Nos. 9, 28, 18, 22, 25 and 27.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 143.*]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 9, 18, 22, 25, 27 and 28 lost. I also declare Motion Nos. 20 and 23 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 19.

• (1810)

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote nay to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote nay to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this amendment would ban replacement workers and I oppose the amendment.

(The House divided on Motion No. 19, which was negated on the following division:)

*Government Orders**(Division No. 144)***YEAS****Members**

Alarie
 Bachand (Saint-Jean)
 Bergeron
 Blaikie
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Dalphond-Guiral
 de Savoye
 Desjarlais
 Dubé (Lévis)
 Dumas
 Gagnon
 Girard-Bujold
 Guay
 Lalonde
 Lebel
 Lill
 Mancini
 Marchand
 McDonough
 Mercier
 Plamondon
 Robinson
 Sauvageau
 Stoffer
 Turp
 Wasylcia-Leis—51

Asselin
 Bellehumeur
 Bigras
 Brien
 Crête
 Davies
 Debien
 Dockrill
 Duceppe
 Earle
 Gauthier
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Guimond
 Laurin
 Lefebvre
 Loubier
 Marceau
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 Ménard
 Nystrom
 Riis
 Rocheleau
 St-Hilaire
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Vautour

NAYS**Members**

Abbott
 Adams
 Anders
 Assad
 Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
 Baker
 Barnes
 Bélair
 Bellemare
 Bertrand
 Bonin
 Boudria
 Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
 Brown
 Bulte
 Caccia
 Calder
 Caplan
 Casey
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Clouthier
 Cohen
 Comuzzi
 Cullen
 De Villers
 Dion
 Doyle
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Duncan
 Eggleton
 Epp
 Finlay
 Fontana
 Fry
 Gallaway
 Godfrey
 Gouk
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Grose
 Harb
 Harvard

Ablonczy
 Alcock
 Anderson
 Assadourian
 Bailey
 Bakopanos
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bevilacqua
 Bonwick
 Bradshaw
 Brison
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Cadman
 Cannis
 Carroll
 Casson
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chatters
 Coderre
 Collenette
 Copps
 Cummins
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Dromisky
 Duhamel
 Easter
 Elley
 Finestone
 Folco
 Forseth
 Gagliano
 Gilmour
 Goodale
 Graham
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Guarnieri
 Hart
 Harvey

Hill (MacLeod)
 Hilstrom
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Jennings
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
 Keyes
 Knutson
 Lastewka
 Lee
 Lincoln
 Lowther
 MacAulay
 Malhi
 Manning
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Massé
 McCormick
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McTeague
 Meredith
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Mitchell
 Muise
 Myers
 Nunziata
 O'Reilly
 Pankiw
 Parrish
 Penson
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Kent—Essex)
 Power
 Price
 Provenzano
 Redman
 Reynolds
 Ritz
 Rock
 Schmidt
 Scott (Skeena)
 Serré
 Solberg
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Julien
 Szabo
 Thiabeault
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Volpe
 Wayne
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)
 Wilfert

Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hoepfner
 Ianno
 Jaffer
 Johnston
 Jordan
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kerpan
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Konrad
 Lavigne
 Leung
 Longfield
 Lunn
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Maloney
 Marleau
 Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McNally
 McWhinney
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Minna
 Morrison
 Murray
 Nault
 Obhrai
 Pagtakhan
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peric
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Pratt
 Proud
 Ramsay
 Reed
 Richardson
 Robillard
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 Speller
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Strahl
 Telegdi
 Thompson (Charlotte)
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Vellacott
 Wappel
 Whelan
 White (North Vancouver)
 Wood —200

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine
 Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
 Canuel
 Fournier
 Marchi
 Perron
 Picard (Drummond)
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
 Drouin
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 Peterson
 Saada

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 19 defeated.

Government Orders

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 26.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 144.*]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 26 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 21.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, you would find unanimous consent that the members who are recorded as having voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay on this motion.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are against this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote nay to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this amendment would provide for final offer selection arbitration as a contract settlement method. I support that amendment.

(The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 145*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Anders
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Casson
Cummins
Elley
Forseth
Gouk
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Kerpan
Lowther
Manning

Ablonczy
Bailey
Cadman
Chatters
Duncan
Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Konrad
Lunn
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)

McNally
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Pankiw
Ramsay
Ritz
Scott (Skeena)
Strahl
Vellacott
White (North Vancouver)—49

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Belanger
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Casey
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Collenette
Copp
Cullen
Davies
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Lill
Longfield
MacAulay
Malhi
Mancini
Marchand
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Massé
McCormick
McGuire
McTeague
Ménard
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly

Meredith
Morrison
Obhrai
Penson
Reynolds
Schmidt
Solberg
Thompson (Wild Rose)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Boudria
Brien
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Doyle
Dubé (Lévis)
Ducpeppe
Dumas
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Leung
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney
Marceau
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Mercier
Minna
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
Pagtakhan

Government Orders

Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Power
Pratt	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Kedman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vautour	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—202

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Pabok
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 21 defeated.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 24.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 145.]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 24 defeated.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure for the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, if the House agrees I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting yea.

• (1815)

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc members, including the hon. member for Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, oppose this motion.

[English]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote yes.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote nay to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting no.

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

(Division No. 146)

YEAS

Members	
Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dockrill
Dromisky	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale	Graham

Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Longfield
Malhi
Mancini
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robinson
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

Grose
Harb
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
MacAulay
Maloney
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—152

Lunn
Manning
Marchand
Matthews
Ménard
Meredith
Morrison
Nunziata
Pankiw
Plamondon
Price
Reynolds
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisé
Obhrai
Penson
Power
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
St-Hilaire
Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vellacott
Wayne
White (North Vancouver) —100

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

CANADA GRAIN ACT

The House resumed from May 11 consideration of Bill C-26, an act to amend the Canada Grain Act and the Agriculture and Agri-food Administrative Monetary Penalties Act and to repeal the Grain Futures Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of several deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of Bill C-26, an act to amend the Canada Grain Act.

The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 5, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with the Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform members present vote yes to this motion.

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bigras
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
de Savoye
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Elley
Forsyth
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison
Casey
Chatters
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Gouk
Guay
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Konrad
Laurin
Lefebvre
Lowther

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Bloc members oppose this motion, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: The members of our party vote yea to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with the Canada Grain Act and really does not affect the residents of York South—Weston, so I am prepared to give the government the benefit of the doubt and support the bill.

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

(Division No. 147)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brison
Cadman	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan	Earle
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hart
Harvey	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lill	Lowther
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews	McDonough
McNally	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Power
Price	Ramsay
Reynolds	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vautour
Vellacott	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver) —79	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Béclair	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye	Debien
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guamieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Lefebvre	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
Malhi	Maloney
Marceau	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nunziata	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi

Thibeault
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—173

Torsney
Turp
Valeri
Venne
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Drouin
Canuel	Godin (Châteauguay)
Fournier	O'Brien (Labrador)
Marchi	Peterson
Perron	Saada
Picard (Drummond)	
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 5, 8, 9, 10 and 11 defeated.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 2.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 147]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 defeated. I also declare Motions Nos. 3, 4 and 6 defeated.

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (1820)

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we did not get our motion so we have to vote no at this stage.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yea to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents I will vote yes.

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

(Division No. 148)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Dubé (Lévis)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Lastewka
Laurin	

Government Orders

Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Lalonde
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nunziata	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Power
Pratt	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vautour	Venne
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood —204	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Cummins	Duncan
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Hart	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoeppner	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vellacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	White (North Vancouver) —48

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

DNA IDENTIFICATION ACT

The House resumed from May 11 consideration of Bill C-3, an act respecting DNA identification and to make consequential amendments to the Criminal Code and other acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: The next deferred recorded divisions are on the motions at the report stage of Bill C-3. The question is on Motion No. 1. A negative vote on Motion No. 1 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 2.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise to seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois vote yes to this motion.

[English]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote nay to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents I will vote no.

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

(Division No. 149)

YEAS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bigras
Blaikie	Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis)	Duceppe
Dumas	Earle
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Guay	Guimond
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lefebvre
Lill	Loubier
Mancini	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	Ménard
Mercier	Nystrom
Plamondon	Riis
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Stoffer	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis—52

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brison
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cummins
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Duncan	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Hart
Harvard	Harvey

Government Orders

Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoeppner
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Lowther	Lunn
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi	Maloney
Manning	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Massé	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nunziata	Obhrai
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Pankiw	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Power	Pratt
Price	Proud
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Reynolds	Richardson
Ritz	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vellacott
Volpe	Wappel
Wayne	Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	White (North Vancouver)
Wilfert	Wood —200

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated.

Government Orders

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find the consent of the House to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 4 and 6.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 149*]

The Speaker: I declare Motion Nos. 4 and 6 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1825)

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting no.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote nay to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting yes to this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 150*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bigras
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Earle
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Guimond
Hart	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lefebvre
Lill	Loubier
Lowther	Lunn
Mancini	Manning
Marceau	Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Plamondon	Ramsay
Reynolds	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Vellacott	Venne
Wasylcyia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)—101	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua

Government Orders

Bonin
Boudria
Brisson
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Casey
Cauchon
Chan
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Malhi
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McWhinney
Minna
Muise
Myers
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Power
Price
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Thompson (Charlotte)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—151

Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Coderre
Collenette
Copps
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Knutson
Lavigne
Leung
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wayne
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, you would find unanimous consent that the members who are recorded as having voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay on this motion.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yes to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in favour of this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 151)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bigras	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brisson	Cadman
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Hart
Harvey	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoeppner	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lalonde	Laurin

Government Orders

Lebel	Lefebvre
Lill	Loubier
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Manning	Marceau
Marchand	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Plamondon
Power	Price
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Ritz
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
St-Hilaire	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vautour
Vellacott	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	White (North Vancouver)—116

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Malhi
Maloney	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis

Parrish	Patry
Peric	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vancielief	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—136

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 defeated.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion Nos. 7 and 8.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 151*]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 7 and 8 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 5.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would consent that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with the Liberal members voting no.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members vote yes to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yes to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this motion would provide for a three year review of the legislation. Accordingly, I will be voting yes.

• (1830)

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 152)

YEAS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bigras	Blaikie
Brien	Brisson
Casey	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Dumas
Earle	Gagnon
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Guay
Guimond	Harvey
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lefebvre
Lill	Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McDonough	Ménard
Mercier	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Plamondon	Power
Price	Riis
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Hilaire
Stoffer	Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Vautour	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne—68

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis

Government Orders

Caplan	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Elley	Epp
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Hart	Harvard
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knudson	Konrad
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Lowther	Lunn
MacAulay	Malhi
Maloney	Manning
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murray	Myers
Nault	Obhrai
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Pankiw	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Reynolds	Richardson
Ritz	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vellacott	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	White (North Vancouver)
Wilfert	Wood —184

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 13.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yes.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote no to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in favour of this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 153)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blaikie
Bonin	Bonwick

Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Dalphon-D-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Lefebvre	Leung
Lill	Lincoln
Longfield	Loubier
MacAulay	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nunziata	Nystrom
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—189	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison	Cadman
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hart
Harvey	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Matthews
McNally	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Power	Price
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vellacott
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver) —63	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, you would find unanimous consent that the members who are recorded as having voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting yea on this motion.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members vote yes to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yes to this motion.

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify the French version of the bill and I support it.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 154*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anders
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brison
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Cummins
Dalphondu-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Elley
Epp	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond

Government Orders

Harb
Harvard
Hill (MacLeod)

Hart
Harvey

(Division No. 154)

YEAS

Members

Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Johnston	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Kerpan	Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	Lowther
Lunn	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manning	Marceau
Marchand	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Pankiw
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Power	Pratt
Price	Proud
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reed
Reynolds	Richardson
Riis	Ritz
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Scott (Skeena)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Stoffer	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Vellacott	Venne
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Wilfert
Wood —252	

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 9 carried.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 14.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division List No. 154]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 14 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 10.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would again find consent in the House that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay, and I would note that the member for Scarborough East, the member for Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge and the member for Whitby—Ajax have left the Chamber.

• (1835)

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

The Speaker: There is no agreement, so we will take a formal vote on Motion No. 10.

• (1840)

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 155)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison	Cadman
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan	Elley

Government Orders

Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Edmonton North)
Harvey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McNally
Mills (Red Deer)
Muisse
Obhrai
Penson
Price
Reynolds
Schmidt
Serré
Steckle
Thompson (Charlotte)
Véllacott
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Forseth
Gouk
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Konrad
Lunn
Manning
Matthews
Meredith
Morrison
Nunziata
Pankiw
Power
Ramsay
Ritz
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)—66

Marceau
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McCormick
McGuire
Ménard
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Plamondon
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Venne
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—181

Marchand
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé
McDonough
McWhinney
Mercier
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Turp
Valeri
Vautour
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Baker
Barnes
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Coderre
Collenette
Copps
Cullen
Davies
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Leung
Lincoln
MacAulay
Maloney

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Boudria
Brien
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Ianno
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Lill
Loubier
Malhi
Mancini

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Canuel
Fournier
Marchi
Perron
Picard (Drummond)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Drouin
Godin (Châteauguay)
O'Brien (Labrador)
Peterson
Saada

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 11.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe that you would find consent in the House to have members who voted on the previous motion recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

• (1845)

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are against this motion.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yes to this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in support of this motion.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, since the last recorded vote the member for Surrey North has had to excuse himself and should not be included in this tally.

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 156)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brison
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Davies	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duncan
Earle	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gouk	Grey (Edmonton North)
Hart	Harvey
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kennedy (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Konrad	Lill
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McDonough	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Power
Price	Ramsay
Reynolds	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Vautour
Vellacott	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)—79	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bertrand

Bevilacqua	Bigras
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Dalphon-Duval	de Savoye
Debien	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knudson	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lincoln
Loubier	MacAulay
Malhi	Maloney
Marceau	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—167	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 lost.

[English]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 12.

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yes.

[Translation]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of our party vote yes to this motion.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[English]

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 156]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this bill on DNA is a small step in the right direction and I will support it.

The Speaker: Therefore I declare Motion No. 12 lost.

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

(Division No. 157)

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

YEAS

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Members

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blaikie
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Loubier
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Marceau

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order for the last time this evening. If the House agrees I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yes.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, having failed to pass those last three motions, we have to vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are in favour of this motion.

Private Members' Business

Marchand	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Massé	Matthews
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nunziata
Nystrom	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Power
Pratt	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Vautour	Venne
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood —199	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoeppner
Jaffer	Johnston
Kennedy (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Kerpan
Konrad	Lowther
Lunn	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver) —47	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Canuel	Drouin
Fournier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Marchi	O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Saada
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

• (1850)

The House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

MACKENZIE-PAPINEAU BATTALION

The House resumed from March 19 consideration of the motion.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise to speak to this motion which I do not support. I wish to explain in some detail why I do not support it.

Some years ago I was in Washington to do some research in the archives. I found the archives were closed, that it was a public holiday and quite an unexpected public holiday. It turned out that it was Memorial Day.

I had nothing to do because I could not work so I walked down into the mall area. I found myself next to the Vietnam memorial. It was the first time I had ever seen the Vietnam memorial. As I said, it was on Memorial Day so quite a few veterans were standing around the memorial.

It has to be imagined. The monument to the Vietnam war in the United States is probably one of the most moving monuments built anywhere in the world. It is quite remarkable. It consists of a huge slab of black marble. A ramp goes down one end and up the other, and on it are engraved all the names of the people who died during the Vietnam war.

Many of the veterans were middle aged since the Vietnam war occurred in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Many people of my age were standing around the Vietnam memorial to pay homage to their fallen comrades. It was very moving. I was surprised to see little Canadian flags everywhere from one end of the memorial to the other. It was quite a shocking contrast to see the Canadian flags against the black.

I did not realize that Canadians had served in the Vietnam war. I was very surprised to find that out. I talked to some of the veterans there at the time who explained that they knew Canadians who fought with them in the rice paddies in Vietnam, Canadians who served with great courage. Some were killed and some were injured. Many of them believed in the cause the Americans were fighting for in Vietnam.

On further inquiry I found out that approximately 10,000 Canadians fought with the Americans in Vietnam. There was such a surge of support for the war among young people in Canada that the Americans set up a special recruitment system whereby Canadians could cross the border to get a letter of acceptance and then go back across the border to join up and serve in the forces.

Many Canadians who served in Vietnam did so because they thought they were fighting against communism. They believed that communism as we saw it in North Korea was a terrible force in the world and they wanted to save the world from it. True idealism brought those Canadians to actually risk their lives in that foreign war.

Canada does not recognize veterans who served in foreign armies. We can see the wisdom of that decision when we consider Vietnam. Those young Canadians who went over there to serve in the American forces in Vietnam believed they were doing the right thing. We now know subsequently that the war in Vietnam was not really a war of the United States fighting to save the free world and sparing it from communism. It was really the United States intervening in a civil war that involved a struggle for independence.

The Vietnamese had been under the heel, literally speaking, of the French, the Vichy French and even the Japanese during the second world war and post second world war. The Vietnamese are very proud people and were very determined to gain their independence.

• (1855)

The war in Vietnam, as we know, led to some very terrible atrocities. I think of My Lai in which Canadian soldiers were distressed by the fact that they could not see the enemy among the civilians so they killed the civilians. The Vietnam war was also a war in which the Americans resorted to chemical warfare in the form of defoliants and agent orange.

I think we would agree that Canada is probably very glad that it did not officially sanction the Canadians fighting in Vietnam because in fact despite their very best intentions they were fighting for a losing cause and a wrong cause. That is the most important issue.

This is one of the dangers when Canadians fight for other countries. They may indeed take up a cause that later is discovered to be a cause that Canada would not want to associate itself with.

The Vietnam war was from 1967 to 1973, the major portion of the war. If we flip back another 30 years we come to 1937 and the Spanish civil war. That war involved the forces of General Franco representing the state and backed by the fascists, backed by Germany and Mussolini but mainly by Nazi Germany, and the republican forces which were backed by the communist power of

Private Members' Business

the day, the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union was instrumental in getting that war rolling because it had a philosophy until recent years of spreading international communism. The Soviet Union made a direct effort to keep the civil war going in Spain.

Part of the Soviet Union's campaign to support the republican side involved the formation of international brigades. These brigades comprised battalions and volunteers who were recruited from all over the world. One of those battalions was the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion.

Approximately 1,300 Canadians went over and joined the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion and fought on the side of the republicans during the Spanish civil war. The Spanish civil war was a terrible war. It was a brutal war. Men, women and children were killed. It was a war that is echoed by the civil war that is now occurring in Algeria.

It was a different world in 1937. As the young men from Canada went over to serve in the republican forces they could not see inside the Soviet Union. They only knew the Soviet Union as a country that was supporting workers and they thought it was a grand new experiment. They thought it was going to free the people, and so with the greatest good spirit they went over to serve in the republican forces.

One of the most famous persons at that time was Norman Bethune who served in the Spanish civil war, not in the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion but by giving medical aid to the republican troops.

We now know in retrospect that far from fighting for democracy, as the member from Kamloops said, they were fighting on the side of the republicans who were supported by the worst dictatorship in the world. The dictator was Stalin. After the war we discovered that this was a communist rule, a dictatorship that would kill millions of people, millions of people in Ukraine and millions of its own people, the Russians.

We have to remember that Norman Bethune went on to China, served in the Chinese forces and became famous there. However China became a dictatorship under Mao and it was one of the cruelest dictatorships in modern time. These people killed millions and they were every bit as bad as Hitler.

We have the dilemma that these people in good spirit and good heart went over to support a cause that Canada and all the world in retrospect realize was actually supporting a cause that was perfectly reprehensible and we would not want to have Canada associated with it.

We have the dilemma that the member for Kamloops wants to acknowledge the courage and contribution to history, the contribution in spirit of the members of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion 60 years ago. He is right in his intention but wrong in the execution.

Private Members' Business

• (1900)

Canada can never take the chance of supporting foreign wars in which the outcome or result may indicate a political entity that is completely unacceptable to Canada.

I will conclude by making a suggestion to the member for Kamloops. In the United States the Canadian Vietnam veterans are recognized and compensated by the United States because of their service in the Vietnam war. I suggest very strongly to the member that he make representations to the Embassy of Spain to see if he can get Spain to make a similar recognition of the members of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion and to get compensation from where it really ought to come and that is Spain.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member across the way for a very enlightening and well researched speech. He made some very good points which I agree with.

I do not agree with the basic premise that the Mac-Paps were going across on some kind of a flawed premise that they were doing something noble and honourable and then found out they were actually pawns or were being used by a larger power.

When the group went over to fight fascism they were right. A couple of years later the Canadian government agreed and declared war. That group recognized the fear of fascism in Europe earlier and chose to take up arms. If the group can be criticized for being aligned with the communists by working with the republic of Spain then so can any of the allies as we joined forces in the second world war to do what we thought was right, which was to smash fascism.

The purpose of the motion as it was worded was to investigate ways to grant some form of recognition to these noble and heroic Canadians. It did not limit us to any particular course of action although first and foremost the goal was to have these people declared and treated as veterans with the full status that veterans enjoy. There are other options which I think we should be talking about today as well.

In my own research on this subject I was very interested to note that the Mac-Paps were named after Mackenzie and Papineau who led the 1837 Rebellion in Upper and Lower Canada. In fact the year the Mac-Paps were formed, 1937, would have been the 100th anniversary of that uprising. I presume that is how the name was chosen.

The member who spoke on behalf of the government was correct. My research shows that 1,300 volunteer soldiers banded together from all parts of Canada to go abroad. Approximately half of them came home. Not all of them died. Some were missing in action. Some actually settled in Europe and did not choose to return to Canada.

The point I would like to dwell on is that ordinary Canadians have to be diligent just as those young Canadians were diligent. When the extreme right wing raises its ugly head, ordinary working Canadians have to be aware of the risk and the threat to democracy as well as the threat to the treasured institutions we value and which make our country great.

I would like to think that is what those people did. In the 1930s those young people were watching the newsreels in their local movie houses and saw the jackboot storming across Europe, the rise of fascism. Canadians travelled overseas to see firsthand what it was like. Tommy Douglas was one in the mid-1930s to visit Europe to see whether it was true. He wanted to find out if the rise of Hitler and the rise of fascism was as threatening as they were hearing. People read about it in the newspapers and came to the very logical conclusion that fascism was the greatest threat they faced.

Rather than talk about it and rather than wait for the government to act, because the Canadian government could have been quicker in getting on board to smash Hitler and smash fascism, that group of people saw fit to put their own lives aside, leave their homes and loved ones and hike off to Europe unsanctioned in a formal way by the Canadian government.

• (1905)

We gave them thanks by making them outlaws. We threatened them with two years jail time for having the temerity to get involved in the battle. It was a battle which we knew at that time to be just and right because within 18 months we were in the same boat as a country leading the fight as one of the early countries in the great struggle of World War II.

These young men and women realized the danger. Instead of being criticized and threatened with legal action they should be recognized and championed and given the full status and full rights other veterans enjoy. They gave their youth for the fight for democracy against fascism.

A parallel can be drawn today in the need for us to be vigilant as pockets of the extreme right wing surface again across Canada. Even within political parties in Canada the right wing is rising up in circumstances similar to what we saw in the 1930s. Many parallels can be drawn. Fascism in Europe really grew out of a period of very poor economic times, tight fiscal policy, high unemployment, and general dissatisfaction. That is when working people and otherwise decent people seem to seek out these extreme alternatives.

Regarding the rise of fascism in Germany, when Eichmann was interviewed in his prison cell he was asked what did he think Adolf Hitler would be remembered for most. His answer was the great way that he solved the unemployment problem. He said nothing about the killing of six million Jews. It was the great way that he

Private Members' Business

solved the unemployment problem. They were really desperate for some kind of relief in the miserable lives they were living.

We saw the recent rise in right wing populism coming out of a period of tight money and economic fiscal policy. The Bank of Canada was trying to fight inflation with high interest rates and screwed it up. It resulted in truly desperate times for a lot of people, especially where I live in western Canada. They sought out extreme right wing solutions. This is what led to the rise of the new right wing populism. As I say we have to be ever on guard and ever vigilant because looking toward those kinds of options brings us all down and threatens the institutions that make Canada great.

The Spanish civil war in many ways acted as a dress rehearsal for the second world war. When Canada saw the international brigades mobilizing, taking action and doing what was necessary, it probably served to inspire Canadian leaders and other world leaders to become motivated and get active.

We are aware that it was not just Franco they were fighting. The Spanish fascists were being backed heavily by Mussolini and by Hitler. They were pouring money in.

This courageous rather ragtag group went over there on dimes and nickels. They passed the hat around to pay their way over. They were poorly armed. We can imagine how much courage it took to go into that kind of armed conflict against some of the greatest world powers of the time. That should be recognized.

Norman Bethune's name was mentioned. He was certainly one of the more famous persons to go over during that period. He was an honourable and noble man. He dedicated his life to elevating the standards of the poor. In health care he broke new ground in terms of transfusion techniques some of which actually was learned on the battlefield in the heat of battle doing triage.

The only valid criticism I have heard against Motion No. 75 is if we do it for this group, how many other groups are we going to have to recognize in some way and apologize for? Nobody is asking for apologies. We are just asking for some serious second consideration in this case. We are looking at a situation where we believe there should be some kind of recognition. If people cannot see fit to grant the full veteran status that we are asking for, then surely they can do two things.

• (1910)

One was made reference to by the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In a letter about this recently he came back reminding us that an order in council was passed at the time making it a criminal offence for Canadians to serve on either side of the Spanish civil war. No charges were actually laid but technically these people committed a crime against Canada by going to fight the fascists on our behalf. The very first and foremost thing we should be doing is striking

that, eliminating that stigma which these 40 or so living Canadian veterans of the Spanish civil war still have to wear.

The other thing we can do, and I think there is interest in this and in fact we have some interest on the government benches, is to put up a monument to the Mac-Paps on the grounds outside the House of Commons. That would be a popular move. It would be the very least we could do.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the debate this evening is on Motion No. 75, that in the opinion of this House the government should consider the advisability of giving members of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion and other Canadians who fought with the Spanish republican forces in the Spanish civil war between 1936 and 1939 the status of veterans under the federal legislation and making them eligible for veterans pensions and benefits.

The wording of this motion is a little strange in that it says consider the advisability. We can consider anything. I wonder whether a motion that is worded quite so tentatively is going to get much of a result. In any event, that is the motion before us.

Here is a little background on the Spanish civil war. The Liberal member opposite who spoke earlier gave some excellent background as well. As he said the Spanish civil war was a savage conflict. It took more than half a million lives. That was long before the days of modern weapons and modern technology. It was noted as a war of terrible atrocities and also some very dramatic acts of heroism.

Historian Hugh Thomas noted that politically the war was a hodgepodge of monarchists, fascists, anarchists, liberals, Trotskyites, communists and others seeking to use the war to advance their particular programs. Thomas has done a very definitive work on the Spanish civil war. It is very interesting reading if anyone is interested in getting more background.

The Soviet Union supported the republic but it was careful not to do so directly. What it did was set up an organization to purchase arms and transport them by covert means to assist the Spanish communist forces.

The communist leader in France, Maurice Thorez, suggested that aid be given to the republic in the form of volunteers raised internationally by foreign communist parties. They would be organized by the Comintern, Communist International, and would be led by foreign communists exiled from their own countries and living in Russia.

The international brigades were seen to have great propaganda value for the communists and were seen as a possible nucleus of an international red army. Such an organization could be the chief recipient of any Soviet aid in Spain and ensure that Soviet arms would be secure in the hands of reliable party members.

Private Members' Business

It might be interesting to note that before Soviet weapons were actually used on Spanish soil, the entire Spanish gold reserve had been dispatched to Russia as security for payment. Russia was not just altruistic in this wonderful battle against fascism.

Most of the ablest leaders in the Comintern were employed in raising volunteers for the international brigades, for example, Joseph Broz who became Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia, and Enrico Togliatti from Italy who later became leader of the Italian communist party.

Historian Thomas tells us that about 60% of the volunteers were communists. Another 20% became communists during their experiences in Spain. Most were young men and members of the working class. A high percentage were unemployed. Many of the Europeans had the experience of street fighting against the fascists in Berlin, Paris and London.

• (1915)

Some of these men were adventurers. Some were hard line communists. Many were idealists, as other speakers have mentioned.

The personal motivations for joining the cause varied widely. It has been suggested that somehow these were visionaries who happened to see the evils of fascism before everybody else did. Unfortunately, they did not see the evils of the extreme left wing which was also raising its ugly head at the same time and they were seconded into that cause which proved equally perilous and brutal for many people in the world.

About a third died in the action in Spain. Several suffered political or professional ostracism because of their Spanish experiences. Many of the eastern Europeans who participated in the campaign were executed in the purges of eastern Europe in 1949.

With respect to the Canadian experience, approximately 1,500 Canadians served the republican cause during the Spanish civil war. They served in several military formations and the unofficial section became to be called the Mackenzie-Papineau section in honour of William Lyon Mackenzie and Louis Joseph Papineau who were leaders of the failed 1837 rebellion against the British ruling classes in Upper and Lower Canada.

The Mac-Paps eventually became a separate battalion, but fewer than a third were Canadians. Most were Americans, as were their first commander and their first political commissar. Both of these men were killed in fighting along the Ebro River.

Mark Zuehlke, in a recent book, says that the group sent a cable to Prime Minister King, who was of course the grandson of William Lyon Mackenzie. The cable read:

We implore you from the depths of our hearts to do everything possible to help Spanish democracy. In so doing you are serving your own interests. We are here for the duration until fascism is defeated.

King never replied, but I think the cable is an indication of how idealistic the people who sent it were. Unfortunately the cause they served turned out to be equally as brutal and oppressive as the fascist cause.

The reason that the Canadians who served in the Mac-Pap battalion were not thought well of and not respected in Canada was simply because they broke the law.

There had been the non-intervention agreement of 1936, supported by all the major European powers as well as Canada, which was in full accord with the agreement. What happened was that the countries agreed on what Churchill called "an absolutely rigid neutrality".

The Liberal government in Canada in the mid and late 1930s did not want to get involved in any international problems and, in fact, would not support some of the rather tentative measures that were put forward by the League of Nations at that time, a pretty toothless organization such as it was, of which Canada was not a strong member.

That being said, Prime Minister King had little sympathy for the republican cause and considered communism a great threat at home and abroad.

Canada revised the Foreign Enlistment Act in 1937 to give legal force to its policy of non-intervention. Travel to Spain and its territories was forbidden. Those who went to Spain to serve on either side of the war from Canada did so in defiance of their government and at their own risk.

That is the basis upon which these individuals were not only not accorded the respect and gratitude due to those who fought on behalf of their country but were in some cases prosecuted because they had broken the law.

Whether the law was right or wrong is not the issue. I think there are a lot of laws passed in this House that some people in the House do not agree with. However, that is not a reason for simply breaking them. We need to respect the rule of law.

That is the position of the Royal Canadian Legion. The legion studied this issue and stated:

It was an offence under Canadian law at the time to fight on any side during that war.

• (1920)

The legion was referring, of course, to the Spanish civil war.

It continued:

The legion supports the rule of law and does not view it as appropriate to advocate a position at this late date which would in effect legitimize that which was illegal at the time. This could set an untenable precedent.

There were many idealistic and heroic acts during the Spanish civil war. We know about the skill, courage and sacrifice of Dr. Norman Bethune, and the dedication of Jean Watts of Toronto and Florence Pike of Falkland, the only two Canadian women to have served in the International Brigades. We know about the wounds suffered by playwright Ted Allan and the hundreds who served and died. It is fitting that these individuals be remembered by their friends, supporters and communities for their idealism and sacrifice, and some have been thus honoured.

Regrettably, it is not appropriate to grant them the status of Canadian veterans. Consequently, in view of all the many factors to be considered, I cannot support this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today to the motion introduced by my colleague, the member for Kamloops, regarding recognition of veterans of the MacKenzie-Papineau Battalion.

I, too, like the member for Châteauguay, would like to see the Canadian government finally recognize members of this battalion as full-fledged veterans.

Despite the battle they waged against fascism, a battle that now seems avant-garde, these soldiers of freedom are still not yet recognized as real veterans.

Canada also took part in the fight against fascism in Europe, a few years after the Mac-Paps fought in Spain, and I therefore think that it is necessary, imperative really, that the Mac-Paps be recognized as real freedom fighters.

The devotion of these men and women was complete and it was primarily governments that waged an all-out battle against fascism in Europe. Some 1,300 Canadians joined about 10,000 French, 3,000 Americans, and Czechs, Yugoslavs and British citizens for the sole purpose of stopping fascism in its tracks in Madrid.

Today we know that these freedom fighters were too thin on the ground and did not have the back-up they needed, because not long after their return to Canada, all of Europe was battling fascism, and did so until the bitter end.

The fascists, having triumphed in Spain and already wielding power in Germany and Italy, set their sights on all of Europe, bolstered by their victory over the international brigades and the Spanish republicans.

Private Members' Business

The international brigades, including the Mackenzie-Papineau battalion, fought bravely on the front lines and we must recognize the nobility of their contribution.

I must remind this House that the Spanish civil war was not like any other war past or future. All wars are unique, iniquitous actually. However, this one marked in a most particular way the involvement of civilians in an armed political conflict, in spite of the inaction of their government, in fact in spite of its orders to the contrary. They were labourers, teachers, journalists, and intellectuals, who left their occupations behind in order to engage in a battle for the defence of freedom.

The Spanish civil war is far more than a mere civil conflict, a simple internal matter within Spain, as the governments of the day claimed it was. This conflict will remain the symbol of the commitment of men and women from all over the world to safeguarding freedom.

The legacy of that civil war is precisely that international commitment to preserve freedom. There were few professional soldiers in the ranks of the Spanish republican forces; most were people who believed in freedom and were prepared to sacrifice themselves to preserve it.

• (1925)

The Spanish civil war is also and perhaps particularly so the commitment by intellectuals to the very essence of a political conflict. It was first the Spanish intellectuals who refused to give in to the military coup. The Federico Garcia Lorcas, the Pablo Picassos and the Joan Miros fought for liberty. Ernest Hemingway, André Malraux and George Orwell traded pen for gun.

Was the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion not also led by someone who lived by the pen rather than the gun? What else but the simple belief that our most precious possession needed defending at all cost would cause Edward-Cecil Smith to leave his paper in favour of the trenches?

It was the ardent defenders of freedom who went to fight alongside the Spanish whose government, the government they had just freely chosen, had been toppled by the military. It was these people whose courage, convictions and determination tested the mettle of the Condor legion sent especially by Hitler in support of the new strong men of Europe and the weapons and military tactics that would soon rout all the armies of Europe.

It was these defenders of liberty who understood long before governments the stakes involved in this little war, the stakes involved for the future of Europe and for the protection of freedom. This is the commitment to freedom we are being asked to recognize by giving the members of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion the status of veterans.

Private Members' Business

Canada must act now, before it is too late to do so. Is Canada, with the United States, not on the short list of countries refusing to recognize the involvement of their citizens in this war? The list may be short, but in my opinion there are still too many names on it—Canada's in particular.

Some oppose this motion for reasons of cost or potential administrative problems. Others because they fear it might encourage our fellow citizens to become involved in any sort of conflict. We must not forget our history and we must remember that, as parliamentarians, we make decisions that soon will come under the scrutiny of historians.

Let us therefore assume our responsibilities and recognize the great valour in the commitment of the members of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion.

[English]

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very honoured to rise today in the House to speak in support of my colleague's motion, M-75, regarding the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion.

I have had personal experience with members of the Mac-Paps who have worked so courageously to bring forward this issue. I would like to congratulate the member for Kamloops for bringing forward this motion to provide understanding and education about this issue and to bring forward to Canadians the wrong that was done to the 1,300 volunteers who very bravely went to fight fascism before it was understood even by the Canadian government at the time.

When we read the history of the Mac-Paps we see the courage that these men and women had and the dedication they displayed in fighting fascism. The fact that they were then vilified and castigated by not just the Canadian government but by the RCMP and by society generally is something that is a real black mark in the history of Canada.

I think what this motion does is bring this issue back to the Canadian people, to say that we must give recognition to this noble and heroic group of Canadians who were willing to stand up to be counted, to make a personal sacrifice, to go to another country because they believed so strongly in defending democracy not only in Canada but also abroad.

● (1930)

One of the real tragedies of this situation is that when many of these brave Canadians tried to enlist in the Canadian Armed Forces during the second world war, they were denied and told they were politically unreliable, these Canadians who had made this commitment.

This is a motion where members of this House can remember the history here. It allows us to give recognition to what is regrettably a

very small group of remaining veterans. There are about 40 members of the Mac-Paps who are still alive. It is important that we remember what they did. It is important that we right a wrong in history. It is important that all parties and all members of this House stand up and give recognition to the work and the commitment the Mac-Paps have made.

I ask other members of the House to put aside partisan politics, to put aside what may have happened back in 1936 and to say that these Canadians must be recognized. What better place to do that than in the House of Commons. There are members of the community, members of their families, their children and their grandchildren who are watching this debate. They are watching to see what we do in the House of Commons to give acknowledgement to the sacrifice these people have made, many of whom have now died.

I call on members of the House to do the honourable and right thing, to recognize the Mac-Paps and to see what we can do to grant some form of recognition to this truly heroic and courageous group of Canadians.

The Deputy Speaker: I advise the House that if the hon. member for Kamloops speaks now he will close the debate.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to say a few closing words in this debate on Motion No. 75, an effort to give appropriate recognition to the MacKenzie-Papineau brigade.

It is fair to say that Canada has shown leadership in the past by acknowledging past wrongs and issuing apologies. In some cases we have provided financial compensation. I refer particularly to the Japanese Canadians who were treated so inappropriately during the second world war. There was an apology and compensation was provided, similarly for first nations peoples humiliated in residential schools. There was an appropriate apology and an indirect form of compensation was indicated. We have seen nations apologize and acknowledge the past wrongs of the Holocaust, apartheid in South Africa, and one could go on and on.

It says an awful lot about a country that can admit it has made errors. Previous governments had debates around some of these issues but they made inappropriate decisions. They were in error. They made mistakes. It takes a great deal of courage for a person to admit to making mistakes and then to move on. It takes some courage for a government and a parliament to say we made a mistake to those who volunteered to fight fascism even before we as a country did.

I appeal to my colleagues from all sides of the House when they vote on this motion to set aside minor problems which have been identified and issues that would make the implementation of this acknowledgement difficult. Do the right thing. For the handful of veterans who are living today in Canada, do the right thing and

Adjournment Debate

indicate that we appreciate the fact that they led the way to combating fascism for our country and in the world.

• (1935)

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made earlier this day, the question on the motion is deemed to have been put and a recorded division deemed demanded and deferred until Monday, May 25, 1998 at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in response to the reply given on March 26, 1998, by the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions to my question on employment insurance.

I had asked why the federal government was refusing to use the surplus in the employment insurance fund to help all the unemployed from coast to coast. Right now, fewer than 40% of unemployed workers are receiving EI benefits. This is all the more serious when one realizes that the surplus in the employment insurance fund is up around \$15 billion.

Why is this government allowing the surplus in the employment insurance fund to mount up when people throughout the country are suffering because of the changes to EI eligibility criteria? It is often forgotten where this surplus comes from. It comes from the workers and employers of this country who pay EI premiums.

As the program's name indicates, this is insurance for the difficult times when one loses one's job. Everyone hopes not to have to turn to this insurance, but the nature of work being what it is today, it is sometimes unavoidable.

Does this government not acknowledge that more than 60% of unemployed people do not qualify for insurance? They are not entitled to their own money. Not because the government lacks money, either, as there is a surplus of \$15 billion in the fund. It is hard to understand why the government refuses to act on this serious matter.

Yesterday, the National Council on Welfare announced that child poverty was at its highest in 17 years. Their report emphasized the direct link between increased poverty and the changes in employment insurance.

In the northeastern part of my province of New Brunswick, the unemployment rate is 23%. One person in four is trying to find a job, and finding nothing. There are thousands of families living in poverty.

It was even announced yesterday that the unemployment rate in New Brunswick was around the 13% mark. Often, the hon. members over there do not believe me when I say that people are suffering because of the changes to employment insurance. This National Council on Welfare report confirms this, in black and white.

The time to do something is now. This government must start working for the people of this country and must address the subjects of concern to all Canadians, such as the elimination of poverty, job creation, and a health system that meets everyone's needs.

Let us start on this right now by reviewing the employment insurance eligibility criteria. Canadians have suffered enough. With \$15 billion, we can put contribution rates back to 60% and cover 70% of workers.

I did some calculations earlier. A person working 420 hours in a fish plant or who has a low paying seasonal job with a minimum salary of \$7.50 an hour, for example, will receive \$3,150 divided by 14 and multiplied by 55, the percentage under employment insurance. He will get \$123.75 a week. Nobody can live on that. All the same, with the considerable surplus that is in the employment insurance fund, this is unacceptable.

What is the government waiting for? Do the Liberals want the poverty rate to climb? Let us change the employment insurance criteria in order to remedy—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade has the floor.

• (1940)

[*English*]

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is committed to job creation and economic growth and it is making considerable progress on that front. Evident from a steadily declining unemployment rate, we intend to see this downward trend continue. The EI premium rate must ensure that there is sufficient revenue each business cycle to pay EI costs at relatively stable rates.

The current surplus makes prudent provision against rate hikes in the event of unforeseen economic and global changes. It also allows the government to address unemployment where it is most severe. For example, similar in concept to the 1997 and 1998 new hires program, the 1998 budget gives employers who hire more young Canadians in 1999 and 2000 an EI premium holiday.

Adjournment Debate

We must also remember that just three years ago the federal government's deficit was \$42 billion. At that time the government looked at all aspects of the fiscal situation and there is no denying that EI surpluses played a role in restoring fiscal health. This was not done in isolation, however, and complemented other difficult decisions.

EI premium rates have been declining since 1994. This year's decrease from \$2.90 to \$2.70 will save Canadians \$1.4 billion in 1998 and premiums will continue to decline as the fiscal situation permits.

MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, opposition to the multilateral agreement on investment, the MAI, has been massive and is still growing.

It is not just the citizens of Canada who are realizing that the MAI is a very bad deal. Also our provincial governments are beginning to realize what a bad deal it is in terms of provincial jurisdiction.

In March of this year I asked a question of the Prime Minister, expressing increasing concern that, for example, in my province of British Columbia government initiatives like the jobs and timber accord and legislation to protect young people from the exploitation of tobacco companies are threatened by the MAI.

The response I received from the government was pathetic. What I was told by the government is: "There is nothing in the negotiations that would threaten the ability of Canada to function and operate its own house".

Canadians know and understand differently. More and more Canadians are understanding that the fundamental impact of the MAI will be to undermine our democratic institutions and to undermine the ability of elected governments to set public policy in the public interest.

In British Columbia the provincial government is so concerned about the impact of the MAI that an all-party committee to undertake public consultation has been struck. The mandate of the special committee is to inquire into and make recommendations regarding all aspects of the MAI through broad public consultation.

Members of the committee will be appointed shortly and the committee is expected to report to the provincial legislature in British Columbia in the coming year.

In speaking to this issue in B.C. the minister responsible, Mr. Farnworth, said make no mistake, the MAI is not dead. While he expressed optimism that the MAI treaty was not signed in Paris when it was anticipated, he does point out, and I and many other Canadians would concur, it is imperative that we take advantage of this delay to continue to press the federal government to have full public debate and hearings and finally to stop this deal from going through.

The minister for employment and investment, Mr. Farnworth, from British Columbia has written to the Minister for International Trade calling on the federal government to hold hearings in all regions of the country and has advised the federal minister not to assume that the MAI will automatically cover provincial measures.

Canadians want to know why the Liberals are so afraid to debate this issue of the MAI. I have been involved in a number of debates in my own riding and in Vancouver where not one Liberal would show up to the debate.

• (1945)

We are calling on the government today to be honest about the MAI, to tell Canadians why it is that it is pushing it through. We want to say to the government that the opposition is increasing. There will be such opposition that we believe the deal will not go through.

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, economic isolationists all over the world are opposed to agreements like the MAI. There are those who believe that one can build a wall around the country and operate its economic system within that wall and in so doing bring prosperity, good health and happiness to all its people.

That was tried at the beginning of 1917 in the Soviet Union. At the point of the collapse of that regime, the financial state was so severe that the country is still in the throes of going through a serious catharsis in terms of recovery.

Canada has learned in recent years that our economy is certainly dependent on international interaction and international trade. Forty per cent of the jobs created in this country are created because Canada exports. Agreements are absolutely essential.

We learned a long time ago that Canada works best if there are rules. We are not a large country that can simply operate in the jungle. We have investors in other countries who are small businessmen. They cannot go over there with batteries of lawyers to engage in litigation. It is much more satisfactory if we have the rules set up and we understand where we are going. As a result Canada is prospering.

Canada will continue to prosper as long as we continue to reach out and interact with all nations of the world.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening on a matter of equity for all Canadian farmers.

On February 19 and on subsequent occasions in the House I asked the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food why he has not extended disaster relief to farmers in the Peace River region of

British Columbia and Alberta who do not qualify under the disaster financial assistance arrangements.

These farmers have endured two devastating years of crop losses due to excess moisture. These arrangements are known as the DFAA. Farmers in the maritimes who suffered last summer under the worst draught in a decade have also been denied disaster relief by the federal government.

Throughout the past two years we have seen special disaster relief programs set up outside the DFAA on four different occasions. The precedent has been set. The federal government has shown that compassion and compensation are available outside the DFAA criteria.

For the Saguenay and the Red River floods special subsidiary programs were established outside the DFAA for farmers suffering losses. More recently the federal government shelled out an extra \$50 million again outside the DFAA for part time Quebec farmers with losses resulting from this January's ice storm. Then again in March the minister of agriculture proudly proclaimed an additional \$20 million in federal funds outside the DFAA for part time Ontario farmers with losses from the ice storm. These were farmers who do not qualify and did not qualify under the regular DFAA rules.

Let me point out that in each of these four cases farmers were deserving of the special arrangements that were made to get them through the devastation caused by these disasters. What is difficult to understand, however, is that the government will not apply the same rules and compassion to all disaster besieged farmers. They have done it not once, not twice or three times but four times.

The federal government has indicated that when the DFAA is not sufficient, when it does not adequately provide financial disaster relief to farmers, the rules can be changed and special programs can be established.

For Peace River and maritime farmers the DFAA is insufficient to meet their needs. The minister of agriculture has stated in the House that these farmers have been treated exactly the same for coverage as farmers in other areas. This is simply not true. Until Peace River and maritime farmers receive the same kind of subsidiary assistance programs as their counterparts have in the Saguenay region, Manitoba, Quebec and Ontario, this injustice will continue.

• (1950)

These are the simple facts. In trying to justify his inequitable treatment of these farmers the minister has also indicated to the House that special subsidiary programs have not been put in place, particularly in Alberta and B.C., simply because those provinces have not asked for it. He made this ridiculous excuse even though

Adjournment Debate

the \$50 million special subsidiary Quebec program was established unilaterally by the federal government without the co-operation of the Quebec government.

I was pleased to see recently that the Alberta minister of agriculture, the hon. Ed Stelmach, called his bluff. He formally asked the federal agricultural minister that a special subsidiary program be established for Alberta farmers in the Peace River region.

I have just learned that Minister Stelmach's request has been denied. I am unaware of what excuse the minister of agriculture used other than maybe his compassion does not exist west of Manitoba.

The truth is that the government is making up the rules as it goes along. If it is to design special subsidiary programs to address Quebec and Ontario farmers who do not qualify under the regular DFAA rules, it should change the criteria for western and eastern farmers as well.

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we realize that farmers in northern Alberta and British Columbia have experienced two wet seasons in a row and have suffered significant production and income loss.

We are also aware of the drought condition that impacted on parts of the maritimes and Ontario in 1997. However assistance under the standing federal-provincial disaster financial assistance arrangement does not apply to the situations cited by the hon. member because it does not cover income losses. It deals with reconstruction and does not provide assistance where insurance is available, particularly crop insurance.

The extension of DFAA assistance to Quebec part time farmers is based on the same rules and the same procedures that applied in previous major disasters such as the Edmonton tornado, the Saguenay floods and the Manitoba Red River flood. The magnitude of these disasters in terms of the broad economic impact were such that a comprehensive subsidiary agreement covering agriculture and industry were implemented.

We believe the existing combination of crop insurance, net income stabilization account, NISA, and companion programs has the best potential to provide the needed support for all Canadian producers in cases of drought and excessive field moisture.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been adopted. The House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow, pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:52 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 12, 1998

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Adams	6819
Committees of the House	
Public Accounts	
Mr. Grose	6819
Centennial Flame Research Award	
Mr. Alcock	6819
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Adams	6819
Mr. Muise	6820
Mr. Cummins	6821

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code	
Bill C-19—Time Allocation Motion	
Mr. Boudria	6821
Mr. Epp	6821
Motion agreed to	6822
Bill C-19. Report stage	6822
Mr. Boudria	6822
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6823
Mr. Boudria	6823
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	6823
Mr. Boudria	6823
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	6823
Mr. Boudria	6823
Mr. Epp	6823
Mr. Boudria	6823
Mrs. Ablonczy	6824
Mr. Strahl	6824
Mr. Wilfert	6825
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	6826
Mr. Myers	6826
Mr. Anders	6827
Mr. Elley	6828
Mr. Anders	6828
Division on Motion No. 9 deferred	6828
Division on Motion No. 28 deferred	6828
Mr. Rocheleau	6828
Motion No. 10	6828
Mrs. Chamberlain	6829
Mr. Elley	6829
Mrs. Chamberlain	6829
Mr. Johnston	6829
Mrs. Chamberlain	6829
Mr. Johnston	6830
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	6830
Division on Motion No. 10 deferred	6831
Mr. Rocheleau	6831
Motions Nos. 11 to 17	6831
Mrs. Chamberlain	6833
Mr. Johnston	6834
Division on Motion No. 11 deferred	6834
Division on Motion No. 13 deferred	6835
Mr. Johnston	6835

Motions Nos. 18 and 20	6835
Mr. Rocheleau	6835
Mr. Johnston	6835
Motions Nos. 22 and 23	6835
Mrs. Chamberlain	6836
Mr. Rocheleau	6837
Mr. McCormick	6838
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	6839
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	6840
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	6841
Mr. Obhrai	6842

Business of the House

Ms. Catterall	6843
Motion	6843
(Motion agreed to)	6843

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-19. Report stage	6843
Mr. Cummins	6843
Mr. Duncan	6845
Mr. Wilfert	6846
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6846

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Canada World Youth

Mr. Perić	6847
-----------------	------

Parkdale Clean-Up Day

Ms. Bulte	6847
-----------------	------

CRTC

Mr. Abbott	6847
------------------	------

Member for Longueuil

Mr. St-Julien	6847
---------------------	------

Police Week

Mr. Myers	6848
-----------------	------

Agriculture

Mr. Hilstrom	6848
--------------------	------

Trade

Mr. Maloney	6848
-------------------	------

Student Summer Employment

Mrs. Redman	6848
-------------------	------

Surrey Youth Recognition Awards

Mr. Cadman	6849
------------------	------

Ukrainian Heritage

Mr. Sekora	6849
------------------	------

David Levine

Mr. Plamondon	6849
---------------------	------

Sports

Mr. Riis	6849
----------------	------

Canadian Nurses

Mr. Thompson (Charlotte)	6850
--------------------------------	------

Lucien Bouchard

Mr. Pillitteri	6850
----------------------	------

Liverpool Regional High School	
Mr. Keddy	6850
International Nurses Day	
Mrs. Dalphond—Guiral	6850
Quebec City Conferences of 1942 and 1943	
Mrs. Jennings	6850
Canadian Armed Forces	
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	6851

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hepatitis C	
Mr. Manning	6851
Mr. Rock	6851
Mr. Manning	6851
Mr. Rock	6851
Mr. Manning	6851
Mr. Rock	6851
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	6852
Mr. Rock	6852
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	6852
Mr. Rock	6852
Poverty	
Mr. Duceppe	6852
Mr. Pettigrew	6852
Mr. Duceppe	6852
Mr. Pettigrew	6852
Mr. Crête	6852
Mr. Pettigrew	6853
Mr. Crête	6853
Mr. Pettigrew	6853
Nuclear Testing	
Mr. Blaikie	6853
Mr. Gray	6853
Mr. Blaikie	6853
Mr. Gray	6853
Sugar Quotas	
Mrs. Wayne	6853
Mr. Reed	6853
Mrs. Wayne	6853
Mr. Reed	6854
Trade	
Mr. Strahl	6854
Mr. Boudria	6854
Mr. Strahl	6854
Mr. Gray	6854
Poverty	
Mrs. Gagnon	6854
Mr. Pettigrew	6854
Mrs. Gagnon	6854
Mr. Pettigrew	6854
Trade	
Miss Grey	6855
Mr. Boudria	6855
Miss Grey	6855
Mr. Gray	6855
Hepatitis C	
Mr. Dumas	6855

Mr. Rock	6855
Mr. Dumas	6855
Mr. Rock	6855
India	
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	6855
Mr. Gray	6856
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	6856
Mr. Goodale	6856
Poverty	
Mr. Ménard	6856
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	6856
Calgary Declaration	
Mr. Bélanger	6856
Mr. Dion	6856
RCMP	
Mr. Ramsay	6856
Mr. Scott (Fredericton)	6856
Mr. Ramsay	6856
Mr. Scott (Fredericton)	6857
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Earle	6857
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	6857
Mr. Earle	6857
Ms. McLellan	6857
Young Offenders Act	
Mr. MacKay	6857
Ms. McLellan	6857
Mr. MacKay	6857
Ms. McLellan	6857
Ms. McLellan	6857
Trade	
Ms. Leung	6857
Mr. Reed	6858
Immigration	
Mr. Reynolds	6858
Ms. Robillard	6858
Varennes Tokamak	
Mr. Bergeron	6858
Mr. Goodale	6858
Health	
Ms. Wasylcyia—Leis	6858
Mr. Rock	6858
Taxation	
Mr. Power	6858
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	6859
Nuclear Testing	
Mr. Shepherd	6859
Mr. Goodale	6859
Points of Order	
Media Leaks	
Mr. Blaikie	6859
GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
Canada Labour Code	
Bill C—19. Report stage	6859
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6859
THE ROYAL ASSENT	
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland)	6860

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-19. Report stage	6860
Mr. Penson	6860
Mr. Elley	6862
Mrs. Ablonczy	6863
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	6864
Division on Motion No. 18 deferred	6865
Division on Motion No. 22 deferred	6866
Mr. Rocheleau	6866
Motion No. 19	6866
Mr. Johnston	6866
Motion No. 25	6866
Mr. Rocheleau	6866
Motion No. 26	6866

Business of the House

Mr. Adams	6866
Motion	6866
(Motion agreed to)	6866

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-19. Report stage	6866
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	6866
Motion No. 27	6866
Mr. Johnston	6866
Motion No. 29	6866
Mr. Rocheleau	6866

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland)	6867
---	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-19. Report stage	6868
Mr. Rocheleau	6868
Mrs. Chamberlain	6869
Mr. Johnston	6869
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	6870
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	6870
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	6870
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	6872
Mr. Gouk	6873
Mrs. Chamberlain	6873
Mr. Wilfert	6873
Mr. Gouk	6874
Mr. Duncan	6876
Division on Motion No. 19 deferred	6876
Division on Motion No. 25 deferred	6876
Division on Motion No. 26 deferred	6877
Mr. Gouk	6877
Mr. Johnston	6877
Motions Nos. 21 and 24	6877
Division on Motion No. 21 deferred	6877
Division on Motion No. 24 deferred	6877
Mr. Rocheleau	6877
Motion No. 31	6877
Division on Motion No. 31 deferred	6878
Motion No. 1 negatived	6879
Ms. Catterall	6879
Motions Nos. 5, 7 and 31 negatived	6879
Ms. Catterall	6879
Mr. Strahl	6879

Mr. Bergeron	6879
Mr. Blaikie	6879
Mr. Harvey	6879
Mr. Nunziata	6879
Motion No. 2 negatived	6880
Ms. Catterall	6880
Mr. Nunziata	6880
Motions Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 negatived ..	6880
Ms. Catterall	6880
Mr. Nunziata	6880
Motions Nos. 6 and 8 negatived	6881
Ms. Catterall	6881
Mr. Strahl	6881
Mr. Bergeron	6881
Mr. Blaikie	6881
Mr. Harvey	6882
Motion No. 3 negatived	6883
Ms. Catterall	6883
Mr. Strahl	6883
Mr. Bergeron	6883
Mr. Blaikie	6883
Mr. Harvey	6883
Mr. Nunziata	6883
Motion No. 4 negatived	6884
Ms. Catterall	6884
Mr. Strahl	6884
Mr. Bergeron	6884
Mr. Blaikie	6884
Mr. Harvey	6884
Mr. Nunziata	6884
Motion No. 30 negatived	6885
Ms. Catterall	6885
Motions Nos. 9, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27 and 28 negatived ..	6885
Ms. Catterall	6885
Mr. Strahl	6885
Mr. Blaikie	6885
Mr. Harvey	6885
Mr. Nunziata	6885
Motion No. 19 negatived	6886
Ms. Catterall	6887
Motion No. 26 negatived	6887
Ms. Catterall	6887
Mr. Strahl	6887
Mr. Bergeron	6887
Mr. Blaikie	6887
Mr. Harvey	6887
Mr. Nunziata	6887
Motion No. 21 negatived	6888
Ms. Catterall	6888
Motion No. 24 negatived	6888
Motion for concurrence	6888
Mr. MacAulay	6888
Ms. Catterall	6888
Mr. Strahl	6888
Mr. Bergeron	6888
Mr. Blaikie	6888
Mr. Harvey	6888
Mr. Nunziata	6888
Motion agreed to	6889

Canada Grain Act

Bill C-26. Report Stage	6889
Ms. Catterall	6889
Mr. Strahl	6889
Mr. Bergeron	6890

Mr. Blaikie	6890
Mr. Harvey	6890
Mr. Nunziata	6890
Motion No. 1 negatived	6891
Ms. Catterall	6891
Motion No. 2 negatived	6891
Motion for concurrence	6891
Mr. Vanclief	6891
Ms. Catterall	6891
Mr. Strahl	6891
Mr. Bergeron	6891
Mr. Blaikie	6891
Mr. Harvey	6891
Mr. Nunziata	6891
Motion agreed to	6892

DNA Identification Act

Bill C–3. Report stage	6892
Ms. Catterall	6892
Mr. Strahl	6892
Mr. Bergeron	6892
Mr. Blaikie	6892
Mr. Harvey	6892
Mr. Nunziata	6892
Motion No. 1 negatived	6893
Ms. Catterall	6894
Motions Nos. 4 and 6 negatived	6894
Ms. Catterall	6894
Mr. Strahl	6894
Mr. Bergeron	6894
Mr. Blaikie	6894
Mr. Harvey	6894
Mr. Nunziata	6894
Motion No. 2 negatived	6895
Ms. Catterall	6895
Mr. Strahl	6895
Mr. Bergeron	6895
Mr. Blaikie	6895
Mr. Harvey	6895
Mr. Nunziata	6895
Motion No. 3 negatived	6896
Ms. Catterall	6896
Motions Nos. 7 and 8 negatived	6896
Ms. Catterall	6896
Mr. Strahl	6896
Mr. Bergeron	6896
Mr. Blaikie	6896
Mr. Harvey	6897
Mr. Nunziata	6897
Motion No. 5 negatived	6898
Ms. Catterall	6898
Mr. Strahl	6898
Mr. Bergeron	6898
Mr. Blaikie	6898
Mr. Harvey	6898

Mr. Nunziata	6898
Motion No. 13 agreed to	6899
Ms. Catterall	6899
Mr. Strahl	6899
Mr. Bergeron	6899
Mr. Blaikie	6899
Mr. Harvey	6899
Mr. Nunziata	6899
Motion No. 9 agreed to	6900
Ms. Catterall	6900
Motion No. 14 agreed to	6900
Ms. Catterall	6900
Motion No. 10 negatived	6901
Ms. Catterall	6901
Mr. Strahl	6901
Mr. Bergeron	6901
Mr. Blaikie	6902
Mr. Harvey	6902
Mr. Nunziata	6902
Mr. Strahl	6902
Motion No. 11 negatived	6903
Ms. Catterall	6903
Motion No. 12 negatived	6903
Motion for concurrence	6903
Mr. Scott (Fredericton)	6903
Ms. Catterall	6903
Mr. Strahl	6903
Mr. Bergeron	6903
Mr. Blaikie	6903
Mr. Harvey	6903
Mr. Nunziata	6903
Motion agreed to	6904

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

MacKenzie–Papineau Battalion

Motion	6904
Mr. Bryden	6904
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	6906
Mrs. Ablonczy	6907
Mr. Turp	6909
Ms. Davies	6910
Mr. Riis	6910
(Divisions deemed demanded and deferred)	6911

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Employment Insurance

Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	6911
Mr. Reed	6911

Multilateral Agreement on Investment

Ms. Davies	6912
Mr. Reed	6912

Disaster Relief

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6912
Mr. Jackson	6913

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,
45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada – Édition, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.