

non-traditional work relationships like telework, contract work and casual employees will be looked at.

As members can see, although I did not lay them all out tonight, the task force has a large task ahead of it. There is a lot to do and not much time to do it. Then we will be able to make informed decisions on the issues raised by the separatist party opposite and on other issues as well taking into account the big picture.

In order to make sense of the whole process we will have to wait until the ongoing studies are complete. Then we will all be able to make an informed decision and a position will be reached by the government on what we will put in front of the House as far as new legislation is concerned.

That is what the federal government believes is the true way. We have put comprehensive labour relations management proposals to the House instead of the piecemeal approach suggested by the member opposite.

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to participate in the debate on Bill C-317, sponsored by the member from the Bloc that deals with the ban on replacement workers.

The Bloc member favours a ban on replacement workers. This stems from the Bloc being very upset with the use of replacement workers by the American owners of the Montreal company known as Ogilvie flour mills. Because flour mills fall under federal jurisdiction and Quebec's provincial anti-replacement worker legislation had no effect on the company, I understand Bloc members feel it is important to bring the legislation forward to the House of Commons for us to review in private members' hour.

The proposal comes from a member of a separatist party that wants to take the province of Quebec out of Canada. We feel they do not realize the consequences of their actions. I do not think they realize the consequences of the bill as well. It is a bit like sandbox diplomacy where a youngster is playing in the sandbox and if he does not get along with his companion he says: "I am going to take my toys and go play in another sandbox. No one else can play with these toys; I will take them with me".

Hopefully when we are dealing with legislation and labour disputes we can get beyond sandbox diplomacy in politics. The sandbox approach to labour disputes and to labour legislation, particularly legislation such as the bill that would ban replacement workers, is not the solution to the problem. It would exacerbate the problem considerably.

I will not go on at great length debating the clauses of the bill proposed by my colleague. However I want to take a brief look at the consequences of labour disputes and perhaps a more constructive and positive way of resolving them other than banning replacement workers and getting into a frustrating

Private Members' Business

battle between labour and management where people take sides. I would also advise my colleague from the Bloc that perhaps this approach to labour legislation and a relationship with labour is not in their political best interests.

• (1855)

All we have to do is look at our political cousins, the New Democratic caucus, and see what has happened to them over the years and what happened to them over this past weekend. They have always catered to the elite in the labour movement, the leaders, and felt that was the key to their political success. Even in their leadership convention over the weekend we saw where labour played a significant role in determining who the leader of the party would be. That has led to their political demise and even to an erosion of support among rank and file union workers because of their position on issues dealing with labour and management.

A word of advice to my colleagues in the Bloc Quebecois is that perhaps for their political well-being they might not be advised to pursue this type of legislation.

I want to discuss labour relations on the west coast, which impact on my part of the world. Western Canada is important. I know we debate Quebec and its relationship within Canada quite a bit these days. However, I just want to deal with the labour situation and replacement labour and perhaps a better approach to solving labour disputes from my perspective in Saskatchewan.

Since 1972, six labour disputes relating to the west coast ports were settled by federal back to work legislation. Two other labour disputes were settled by federal back to work legislation in 1988 and 1991. They were also directly related to grain handling disputes in British Columbia, although they were somewhat different.

Within the current term of this 35th Parliament, two labour disputes have occurred at the west coast ports and there had to be back to work legislation. Specifically, these are the West Coast Ports Operation Act, Bill C-10, and the West Coast Ports Operation Act 1995, Bill C-74. These relate to disputes occurring in February 1994 and March 1995.

That brings me to the principle of the right to strike, the right to lock out workers, and the right to replace workers with so-called scab labour, or the opposite of that, the right to implement legislation that would ban the hiring of replacement workers.

The strike and the lockout are effective tools in the labour and management arsenal. They have been using these for a long time to bring about a resolution. Usually the side with the deepest pockets and the strongest resolve to win will force resolution in their favour. We respect this mechanism. If that is the approach that labour and management want to take, we respect it. It is not