

This government is a disgrace. This government has botched this affair so badly that it amounts to nothing but a national disgrace. I say to the President of the Treasury Board through you, Madam Chairman, that he should get up and withdraw this bill at once. He has no business forcing this kind of legislation on the public without a mediator, without following the usual practices of labour negotiations. He knows that is his responsibility.

I would love to be able to quote more, but I know that my time is running out.

Some hon. members: More, more.

Mr. Milliken: I told you they want more. I could continue, Madam Chairman, with the speeches of the Minister of Supply and Services. He refers if you please—he is a minister as I say from the Ottawa area—to fat cats in the Public Service. He, of all people, refers to fat cats in the Public Service.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Chairman: It being ten o'clock p.m.—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Chairman: Order. Order, please.

It being ten o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made Tuesday, September 17, 1991, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of Bill C-29 at the committee stage.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Chairman: The first clause to study is clause 2.

[*Translation*]

On clause 2, it is moved—

Order, please.

Mr. Loiselle moves:

That clause 2 of Bill C-29 be amended

(a) by striking out line 2 on page 2 and substituting the following:

“Schedule I to that Act,”

(b) by striking out line 20 on page 2 and substituting the following:

“paragraph (i), or

(c) in one lump sum payment that may be made payable; on or after the coming into force of this Act, to or for the benefit of an employee whose rate of pay does not exceed \$27,500 and that is in an amount equal to

Government Orders

(i) where the lump sum is payable to or for the benefit of an employee whose rate of pay does not exceed \$27,000, \$500, or

(ii) where the lump sum is payable to or for the benefit of an employee whose rate of pay exceeds \$27,000 but does not exceed \$27,500, that portion of \$500 that the rate of pay for that employee exceeds \$27,000;”

The amendment is admissible. Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment carried.

[*English*]

The Chairman: On clause 2, the second amendment. Mrs. Catterall moved:

That clause 2 be amended at page 3 by deleting the lines 2 through 6 and substituting the following therefor:

“amount of pay”.

This amendment is also acceptable. Is it the pleasure of the Committee to accept this amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Amendment (Mrs. Catterall) agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 2, as amended, carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Clause 2 agreed to.

The Chairman: On clause 3, Mrs. Catterall moved:

That Bill C-29 be amended in clause 3 by adding immediately following line 31 on page 3 the following:

(e) persons engaged as independent contractors

This amendment is out of order. It is not intelligible, as it would require a subsequent amendment to subclause 4.

We will now move to amendment no. 4. Ms. Langan moved:

(a) That clause 3 be amended by striking lines 13 to 42.

(b) That clause 3 be further amended by striking the word “not” at line 43.

This is out of order. This amendment really attempts to redraft the clause. According to Beauchesne, S 698(9), it cannot be accepted.

Hence, shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.