

Routine Proceedings

I would encourage all hon. members to desist from saying whether they are for or against certain petitions.

I have been letting this go for some time. Hon. members will understand that sometimes hon. members are put into positions in which they do not really want to say whether they are for or against a petition but it is their duty to present petitions to the House.

The point of the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway is well taken and I would encourage all hon. members to desist saying whether there is concurrence or not.

* * *

LABOUR

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the work stoppage in west coast ports has dangerous implications for the economy of western Canada and therefore legislation is urgently required to reopen the ports.

Therefore I move, pursuant to Standing Order 53:

That the 48 hours notice be waived in order to permit the Minister of Labour immediately to introduce a bill entitled an act respecting the supervision of longshoring and related operations at west coast ports and,

That the House not adjourn this day except pursuant to a motion by a minister of the crown.

• (1535)

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

Fewer than 10 members have risen to object, pursuant to Standing Order 53(4) the motion is adopted.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

WEST COAST PORTS OPERATIONS ACT, 1995

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-74, an act respecting the supervision of longshoring and related operations at west coast ports.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

The Speaker: When shall the bill be read the second time?

Some hon. members: Later this day.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

STANDING ORDER 53

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was looking at Standing Order 53, the provision

under which the motion was presented to the House. I believe the motion presented is actually in contradiction of the intention of Standing Order 53.

Standing Order 53(3) says:

Proceedings on any such motion shall be subject to the following conditions:

(a) The Speaker may permit debate thereon for a period not exceeding one hour;

The intention of Standing Order 53, when it was passed by the House was not to allow debate to exceed one hour. The minister and government have proposed we ignore the intent of this regulation and continue debate until such time as a minister of the crown deems the day is over.

I believe this is specifically against the intention of the Standing Order. I would like the Chair to review this before we proceed any further along these lines.

• (1540)

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as I understand the provisions of Standing Order 53, this is a matter of a very urgent nature in which the normal rules of the House are suspended.

In this instance clearly we are talking about overriding collective bargaining rights and moving directly to a bill. As I understand it, before the question is put on the motion, members of the House should at least be given an opportunity to be heard on whether this matter is of sufficient urgency to should proceed under the extraordinary provisions of Standing Order 53.

This is a very serious matter. I spoke with the president of the Longshoremen's Union Local 514, Doug Sigurdson. He indicated they are currently in conciliation on this matter. The government wants to short circuit the collective bargaining process and move directly.

If that is to happen, the Chair should allow members of this House the courtesy of being heard under the provisions of Standing Order 53. That was not done and I would appeal to the Speaker to reconsider his position and to give us an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, what has happened is perfectly proper.

• On the motion the government introduced, there seem to be two points raised by the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway and the hon. member for Battlefords—Meadowlake. The points are separate and so I will try to deal with them separately.

The first one is that somehow the motion proposed extends the debate on this motion which has been disposed of by the House for more than an hour. That is not correct. The debate is over. No one who rose to debate the motion when the motion was put to the House.