

Supply

● (1130)

Mr. Speaker: I thank Hon. Members who have contributed to this discussion. Their advice has been most helpful. However, the responsibility imposed upon the Speaker by Standing Order 62(4)(c) is for the Chair alone. Only last week it fell to the Chair to exercise the same duty and it will be its duty again, as I said the last time, to exercise its power of selection on the basis of fair play and impartiality.

One of the issues which has been raised is how we count Supply periods. Normally the Parties in opposition are in agreement on what they are doing. When they are in agreement, the Chair has no problem. However, when the Parties are not in agreement, the Chair must decide on what basis we will count the allotted days. In these circumstances I propose to count the three Supply periods ending on June 30 this year. That is the Supply period ending December 10, the Supply period ending March 26, and the Supply period ending June 30.

On the basis of this count, six of the allotted days have been awarded to the NDP. Also on the basis of this count, it amounts to 24 per cent of the 25 allotted days. Eighteen of the allotted days have been awarded to the Progressive Conservative Party, or 72 per cent. In terms of the numbers, a little over 76 per cent relate to members of the Conservative Party and a little over 23 per cent to members of the New Democratic Party. On the basis of a mathematical distribution, using this method of counting, I award this day to the Official Opposition. This would give them 19 out of 25 allotted days, or 76 per cent, within the three periods. This reflects very closely the percentage of Opposition seats in the House.

I also point out that the content of the two motions put forward by the Opposition Parties is sufficiently similar to enable both of them to have the debate they are seeking. I am not ruling on the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) concerning the style or the nature of the motion.

I reiterate the point that the Chair has been urging as recently as last week, that the House, perhaps through the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, should clarify its intent with regard to the allocation of allotted days. In the circumstances, I call the motion in the name of the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman).

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—CANADA LABOUR CODE

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West) moved:

That this House condemns the government for failing to introduce amendments to the Canada Labour Code during the first four years of this Parliament, and by so doing, unnecessarily putting at risk the health and safety of Canadian workers, failing to address the concerns of women in the workplace, and inadequately addressing the issue of technological change.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the concerns of workers in Canada have not been met by this Parliament. They have not been met in the entire life of this Parliament. There were promises. From these promises grew some measure of hope. From that hope a large amount of fanfare and legislation was brought

forward. I am confident that in all likelihood, as this legislation is discussed during second reading, the interests of workers of Canada will still not be met, and that it will fall to a new Conservative Government to create a new blueprint in the form of new legislation. Our blueprint will provide justice, equity, safety and productivity in a rapidly changing workforce.

My reaction to the legislation which may come before the House was certainly one of disappointment. It is not what Canadians want. What Canadians want today is jobs. They want almost any kind of job. There is a sense of desperation and fear in the workplace. That desperation and fear are not addressed in the House of Commons through the Minister of Labour (Mr. Caccia), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) or through the many speeches we have heard in the House of Commons. The reality is that there are no jobs. I face that fear every day in my constituency office and in my constituency, as do other Hon. Members. We face it among our children. We face it among our friends. It is real and the Minister knows it. It is not addressed by any anticipated legislation before the House of Commons.

Canadians want jobs. They do not want make-work programs by governments. Canadians want new jobs through the development and creation of new wealth and power in Canada. That is where the jobs have to come from—the creation of new wealth, new opportunity and new power in Canada. They want jobs from an expanding and growing economy which will assure the security of job opportunity in the workplace. That is from where security comes—new jobs, the creation of new and more jobs. The kinds of jobs we must have should provide job security, not six-month security nor a make-work program. They must provide a real security which comes from an expanding and growing economy.

Along with this creation of new jobs and new wealth, we must look at the condition of those jobs. We want those jobs to be in safe places to work. We want the condition of those jobs to be that of justice, equity and sharing. The labourers and workers should share in the fruits of their efforts.

Instead, in Canada today we are faced with more and more workers trying to share less and less jobs at a time when business after business is going bankrupt, from the smallest to the largest. The engine of our productivity is damaged to the point where we wonder whether it can recover. Everyone is starting to fight to share a diminishing labour force or workforce, a diminishing capacity for jobs. This is the tone which we face in 1984. We must remember the human misery which is associated with this. It is the hurt to the mother, to the child and to the weak in society who are crushed by not having jobs. They are being crushed today in a way we have never seen before. This is the concern of Canadians.

What do we have in place? We have the offer of a blueprint or a hope. The blueprint is nothing but the extension of a few more social benefits. There are no real guarantees about a safer workplace. Also it has a definition of sexual harassment which supposedly is innovative but is totally ineffective.