

*Motions for Papers*ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING
CONSULTANTS' FEESMotion No. 103—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all agreements and arrangements on consultant fees negotiated between the Government of Canada and the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada and provincial associations of the Professional Engineers of Canada as mentioned in reply to Question No. 1,256, Tabled on May 14, 1969.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, this relates to an agreement made between the department and a professional body regarding consultants' fees. It was a verbal agreement so there are no written documents. If the hon. member wishes to press the matter, it would have to be a nil return. Perhaps he would like to drop the motion.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING ESTABLISH-
MENT OF ELECTRIC REDUCTION COMPANY
PHOSPHORUS PLANTMotion No. 151—**Mr. Carter:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada, Bedford Institute of Oceanography, and the Government of the Province of Newfoundland or any of its agencies regarding the establishment of the Electric Reduction Company Phosphorous Plant at Long Harbour, Placentia Bay, Newfoundland.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, this motion, No. 151, is similar in content to motion No. 204 also put down by the hon. member during the last session. When the motion was called on October 22, the government's response was as follows: "Mr. Speaker, the correspondence requested in this motion which can be produced has already been approved by the acceptance of motions Nos. 198 and 199. In view of this fact I would suggest that the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion."

At that time the hon. member withdrew his motion and since there has been no change in the circumstances surrounding the motion since that time, I would suggest that he may wish to adopt the same attitude at this time.

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, the information requested in my latest motion was not contained in the reply to the original motion put before the House

[Mr. Orlikow.]

by the hon. member, so I must ask that the motion stand and, if necessary, be transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Motion transferred for debate. Shall the remaining notices of motions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTIONS

LABOUR RELATIONS

LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE—FAILURE TO
RATIFY SETTLEMENT—INQUIRY
AS TO ACTION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. Arising from the rejection last night by the British Columbia longshoremen of the proposed contract settlement, what action are the minister and the government now going to take?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I might say that I am rather disappointed that the unions on two occasions have rejected the recommendations of their negotiating committee. The last proposal which they rejected was the unanimous recommendation of their executive committee to accept the settlement proposed just the other evening. Since then I have been in touch with management and labour and a form of action has been agreed upon, but at the moment I am not prepared to reveal it publicly. I would only ask that the House be patient for a few more days. I will be prepared to make a statement not later than Friday.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the grave effects of this strike on the economy of British Columbia, the Yukon and western Canada generally, and in view of the minister's statement a week ago that if a settlement was not reached he would be forced to make use of legislation, for how long is he prepared to let the strike continue without recommending to Parliament some form of legislative action to re-open the affected ports?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman has raised a good point. In these matters there comes a moment of truth. Any Minister of Labour is guided in these matters by jurisprudence and what has happened in the past. I think the hon. gentleman ought to look at what happened in 1958 when