

Government Orders

We could have had a similar situation with the hospital services groups as well. There is a veteran's home in Saskatoon and many of the families of the residents in that home have contacted my office and indicated to me that they were particularly distressed that their family members would be moved. The fact that the government moved them indicates that it had very little intention of bargaining in a very serious manner.

I cannot tell you how disturbed these people are that their family members were moved out of that home. I do not understand the situation in that I do not have anyone who is living in a home such as that. I am told that when one has been a resident of a veterans' home for a considerable period of time, one develops a routine and a relationship with the people around one. This includes the people who are on strike at the present time.

The union's offer of essential services should have been accepted. Who, Madam Speaker, knows better than the people involved, what those absolutely essential services are? I am very confident that just as surely as the ships' crews behave responsibly in relation to their dispute with their employer, the hospital services people would have done as well. I think it is despicable that the government did not take the Public Service Alliance of Canada up on its offer and use the people which the union was willing to supply them with in order to get through what, of course, is a rough time for all concerned. It is despicable that we should find ourselves in this position

The legislation itself does have the usual Draconian elements. Initially being forced back to work, then the salve of trying to show that things are going to go smoothly, followed by conciliation, there is no imposed settlement in the agreement. Nonetheless, the hammer is still there. Can you imagine one of those single parent women out there fined "as little as" \$500 a day. Do you know how much \$500 a day is in relation to what they earn in a year? I suppose it may be 5 per cent. I think a 5 per cent per day fine is rather high for almost any activity that one could find oneself in.

Madam Speaker, I see my time is up. I can only reiterate that this legislation is unnecessary in both cases. This thing could have been settled amicably.

Hon. Gerald S. Merrithew (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Madam Speaker, noting the hour and knowing that all hon. members would want the fullest possible opportunity for debate on Bill C-49, pursuant to Standing Order 26(1) I would move:

That the House continue to sit between one o'clock and two o'clock p.m. this day for the purpose of considering Bill C-49.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester (Mr. Bellemare), on a point of order.

Mr. Bellemare: Madam Speaker, I am no expert on parliamentary procedure, but my NDP colleague cut short his speech because members on the other side of the House were shouting that he had gone over the time allowed. Just look at them, the two ministers from Montreal who seem to think it is great fun to shout down the hon. member, who wanted to speak until one o'clock. They cut him off. Madam Speaker, when a bill is introduced, does a party's first spokesperson have limited speaking time?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order, order! To answer the question put by the hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester, the hon. member was allowed 40 minutes and I can assure the hon. member that when I signaled to the hon. member for Saskatoon—Dundurn that his 40 minutes had expired, there was still one minute left before one o'clock.

We are now on the motion.

[*English*]

Will those members who object to the motion please rise in their places.

And more than 15 members having risen.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 26(2), the motion is deemed to have been withdrawn.

[*Translation*]

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1.03 p.m. the House took recess.