

The schedule of committee work does not appear to be as heavy as in recent weeks, but I can assure honourable senators that there will be considerably more work in the chamber, so the total workload will remain heavy.

On Tuesday night we will proceed with consideration of the Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture on Bill C-34, and consideration of the Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science on Bill C-33. We will also commence the second reading debate on Bill C-44 and on Bill C-32. On Wednesday we will continue with the second reading debate on Bill C-44 and Bill C-32, and with other items on the Order Paper. In addition to the foregoing, more legislation will be coming to us next week from the other place.

Senator Buckwold: Honourable senators, may I state for the record that the meeting of the Standing Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Service will meet at 11 a.m. rather than at 8 p.m. as announced earlier. That will be on Tuesday.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

THREATENED STRIKE OF MONTREAL POLICE FORCE— QUESTION

Senator Flynn: Honourable senators, may I ask the Leader of the Government if he has anything to report on the threatened strike of police in the city of Montreal? I ask this because it has been rumoured that the federal government has been invited to lend the army's support to the city if the situation should become serious.

Senator Perrault: The government naturally would like to be helpful in any such eventuality. However, I can report that there has been no formal request as yet received from the Government of the Province of Quebec with respect to any emergency which might arise.

STRIKE OF LONGSHOREMEN IN QUEBEC—BACK-TO-WORK LEGISLATION—QUESTION

Senator Flynn: Would the Leader of the Government inform the Senate whether he has heard anything more with respect to the situation in the ports on the St. Lawrence?

Senator Perrault: The federal government may serve today the International Longshoremen's Association with notice that the federal government will apply to the federal court for an order to enforce the legislation passed by Parliament. Representatives of the federal Department of Justice may appear on Monday to apply for a court order compelling the men to return to work. However, it is hoped by the government that none of these actions will be required and there will be a return to work. Disobedience of the order will result in the usual enforcement proceedings for disobedience, including fine and/or imprisonment. However, I repeat that the government is hopeful that there will be a voluntary return to work and that it will not be necessary to resort to these other measures.

Senator Flynn: Would the Leader of the Government tell the Senate whether it is necessary to apply to the court for an injunction to enforce the union to obey the law? Are there no direct measures that could be employed? Can the leader tell us whether the Minister of Justice is considering charging the union and its members for disobeying the law and having a fine imposed without the injunction? It seems to me illogical to ask the court to tell people that they must obey the law.

Senator Perrault: Meetings have been underway during the past two or three days in an endeavour to explore every avenue and every legal recourse. The announcement I have made to the Senate this afternoon is the last official word I have had from the Department of Labour and the Department of Justice. If other alternatives are open, I will report immediately to the Senate, hopefully this afternoon.

MULTICULTURALISM

MINISTRY OF STATE—ORGANIZATION AND BUDGET— QUESTION

Senator Yuzyk: I would like to ask the Leader of the Government when I may expect the answers to the questions I raised in this chamber on March 26 last?

Senator Perrault: I am unable to give the honourable senator a definitive answer. However, I wish to assure you that every possible effort is made to reply to questions asked in this chamber as soon as the information can be obtained. I will make a further inquiry today to determine whether there has been any accidental or inordinate delay.

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION BILL

SECOND READING

The Senate resumed from yesterday the debate on the motion of Senator Forsey for second reading of Bill C-5, to establish the Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, to amend the Broadcasting Act and other Acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential provisions.

Hon. Rhéal Bélisle: Honourable senators, I congratulate the sponsor, Senator Forsey, on the manner in which he presented this important bill. Although Bill C-5 is simply a re-organization bill with regard to the Canadian Radio-Television Commission and certain functions of the Canadian Transport Commission, substituting a new administrative body, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, there are certain criticisms which I think should be made with respect to the adoption of this bill in its present form.

Bill C-5 solidifies the position of the government vis-à-vis the provinces without their consent or consultation. The provincial ministers' conference in Quebec City in 1972 resulted in the federal government being accused of duplicating provincial telecommunications systems in licensing the CN-CP telecommunications network.

• (1420)

In addition, in 1973 the provincial Communications ministers' conference pleaded with Ottawa to stay out of the