

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker. Why does the government not put the legislation regarding old age pensions on the order paper? Why continue this cat and mouse game by the government with those who are in need and who require assistance? I refer to the old age pensioners of this country. Why this cat and mouse game?

An hon. Member: And not on July 1, 1968.

Mr. Pearson: The best way to reach this legislation is to get the legislation through that is now on the order paper, and which is also very urgent.

LABOUR RELATIONS**REPORTED SPEECH BY MANPOWER MINISTER
RESPECTING STRIKE BREAKERS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration with reference to the address he gave to the law students of Laval University, in which he is reported as saying that Canada should have a law to prevent the use of strike breakers in labour conflicts. I now ask the minister whether the government intends to introduce legislation along the lines he advocated in the speech to the students in question.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I delivered a speech before the law students of Laval University and I tried to explain to them why the labour movement objected to injunctions, and also why it wanted protection in its lawful strike action. That was an explanation and not a statement of government policy.

[*English*]

CANADA LABOUR (SAFETY) CODE**PROVISION FOR EMPLOYMENT SAFETY IN
FEDERAL WORKS**

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-35, respecting the prevention of employment injury in federal works, undertakings and business.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, last night one of the three independent members objected to giving unanimous consent of the house in order

[*Mr. Diefenbaker.*]

to refer the bill to the committee and I should like to explain why, on behalf of my colleagues.

We are quite willing to co-operate with all parties; only, we find ourselves in an unfavourable situation. Since we do not attend the meetings of party leaders, we do not know what is going on. Copies of minister's statements are distributed to the members, but we do not get any. Copies of proposed amendments are also distributed in the house, but not to us.

We want to co-operate, but provided we get the same treatment as everybody else.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member must realize that since the motion for second reading of the bill is now before the house, he cannot explain why he objected to its introduction last night. He must restrict his remarks to the principle of the bill under discussion.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, I am not so much trying to explain why we objected yesterday, but rather why we shall have to raise an objection this morning if we cannot be treated like all other members.

I should like to obtain from you, or from the person responsible, the assurance that we shall be treated like all other members and that we shall be told what is going on. Under these conditions, we shall assure the house of our full co-operation.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain), may I point out to you that he is now asking that a copy of all amendments be given to every independent member. As independents, they do not make common cause with each other; they do not even represent a new party and they want to be treated like other members. For the information of the member, I must tell him that the official opposition, which comprises no less than 95 members, gets only one copy of proposed amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would again remind the hon. member for Edmonton West that we must deal at present with the principle of this bill.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the standing committee on labour and employment.