

● (3:40 p.m.)

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) made a very effective speech yesterday. He was a little concerned, as he had the right to be, about the powers at my disposal through the regulations made pursuant to the bill. I have just outlined one of the reasons I need these regulations, in order to make these provisions as flexible as possible—not to help the employer but to make the bill as practicable as possible, something that perhaps was not provided for in 1965.

With regard to individual termination, I think the two weeks that we have suggested is quite in order with private bills that I have studied and quite in order with the findings of the study to which I have made reference, and is sufficient advance notice to enable Manpower to look after the problems of one individual. Taken in conjunction with the provisions of holiday and severance pay, the period is certainly long enough and pretty much in line with the provisions in collective agreements.

Severance pay provisions have been criticized because some hon. members felt they did not go far enough. I suppose such criticism is logical in that in the eyes of some people we never go far enough. I do not mean this sarcastically, but the important thing here is not so much that the provisions do not go far enough but that we have them at all. To the best of my knowledge this is the only Labour (Standards) Code in North America that includes provisions relating to severance pay. So that while hon. members may say the five-year qualifying period is too long, or that the provision of two days' pay for every year's service is insufficient, the fact remains that we have broken new ground with this piece of legislation and we can study it again in depth in committee.

Finally, in discussing garnishment, there is no use belabouring the point. I suppose the general feeling in the House is that in all probability we should have made provision for this a long time ago. I understand that more than one suggestion has been made that another minister look at the concept of garnisheeing wages with a view perhaps to obliterating this social evil entirely.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question so as to make clear one point that has not been referred to at all in the course of this debate? In view of the fact that the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, which were tabled a few days ago by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) include a consolidation of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, the Canada Labour (Safety) Code, the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act and three or four other labour acts into one massive statute called the Canada Labour Code, may we assume that at the end of the process this bill will in fact amend that consolidated Canada Labour Code?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to assume anything. The hon. gentleman is asking me a question regarding an area he is much more knowledgeable about than I am. This could be the end result and I might

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

presume that the question is really the answer. I can find out if I can enlighten the House.

Yesterday one hon. member on this side made a contribution in the wrong debate. I do not endorse anything he said. The hon. member said we had no labour policy in this House. Our policy is one of fair play to all Canadians no matter whether they are in the work force or on the employer's side. I am prepared to debate this with my colleague when the appropriate piece of legislation is before the House later this session.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

* * *

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING AGENCIES BILL

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MARKETING COUNCIL AND AGENCIES

The House resumed, from Tuesday, April 27, consideration of Bill C-176, to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and motion No. 1 (Mr. Horner).

Mr. Speaker: Before calling on the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) to resume the remarks he was making last evening in connection with the motion now before the House, I might make some brief remarks in connection with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Crowfoot in regard to the possible grouping of the motions.

The hon. member suggested that motions Nos. 1, 5 and 22 be grouped as one and that debate on motion No. 1 cover at the same time motions Nos. 5 and 22. Though it had not appeared to the Chair originally that this might be the logical way to debate the matter, on reconsideration and after studying the argument made by the hon. member last evening this would appear to be a reasonable suggestion and I can see no objection to the grouping suggested by the hon. member for Crowfoot. I believe he also suggested that there be a separate vote on each motion, and with that the Chair is prepared to agree.

It has also been brought to my attention that it has been suggested that motion No. 26 not be grouped with motions Nos. 24 and 25, as had been proposed by the Chair. Again, I would think that this suggestion would be a reasonable one and that motions Nos. 24 and 25 which stand in the name of the hon. member for Crowfoot be considered as one, that motion No. 26, which stands in the name of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) be considered separately, and that there be separate votes on each of these three motions.

I see the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) indicating that he would like to comment on this suggestion of the Chair and I will recognize him.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my comment is very brief. I simply wish to say that with the change Your Honour has suggested regarding motion