

Government Orders

equity and pay equality, there is no real purpose served by superficial amendments that just cater to the purists or people who have very defined legal views of the language used in the statute.

While I am on my feet I would like to again address the whole point behind this legislation. The situation in Canada is that we have no clear definition of essential services. I think everyone would be better off if all workers engaged in essential services knew that the work and activity in which they were involved was subject to special legislation that precluded the possibility of a work stoppage.

I hope that some day the Parliament of Canada will establish essential service legislation so that those engaged in that activity will recognize from day one that when they engage in that activity, they will not be allowed to stop that work contrary to the interests of the whole nation. Until we get this legislation we are going to have to deal with these matters on an ad hoc basis as they arise. We will have to assess in each case whether the legislated rights of workers will govern in a particular circumstance or whether the broader public interest will govern.

Again, let me remind all members of the House that the difficulty is in our failure to define essential services and our failure to deal with those services on a clear statutory base. We are left with dealing with situations as they arise. I think everyone in this House will agree that that is an unfortunate situation but until we can come to some consensus on appropriate limitations to the right to stop work, even where it is at the expense of the public, we are faced with these situations and we have to deal with them as our best judgment allows.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The minister referred to proceedings at the committee and I think inadvertently he has misinformed the House as to the discussion that took place at the committee. I have the minutes with me.

Just so the House will know the content of the discussion, in fact the motion was not accepted or rejected, but there was an agreement that the wording

would be looked at to accomplish the objective. It is that wording that is now before the House. There was no advice or recommendation from the officials there that this was not necessary and I would be happy to provide the member with the actual discussion if he wishes to review it. I think it is important that this House not be misinformed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is a disagreement between two members. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say ye.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8) the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Ron Fisher (Saskatoon—Dundurn): moved:

Motion No. 5.

That Bill C-49 be amended in Clause 8 by striking out lines 15 to 20 at page 4.

Motion No. 7.

That Bill C-49 be amended in Clause 8 by adding immediately after line 38 at page 4 the following:

“(4) The members of the Conciliation Board shall, within five days of their appointment, attempt to agree on a nominee for chairman of the Conciliation Board.

(5) On receipt of a nomination within the period referred to in subsection (4), the Chairman shall appoint the nominee as the chairman of the Conciliation Board for which the person was nominated.