

Government Orders

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mrs. Champagne in the chair.

[*Translation*]

The Chairman: Order. House in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-44, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (geographic certification).

On Clause 1—*Representative*

[*English*]

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Chairman, it is not my purpose to ask a number of questions on this particular legislation. However I would like the member answering for the government to indicate when the employer requested this injunction and when he received the injunction.

Mr. Pierre H. Vincent (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Chairman, if my memory is good a temporary one was given in 1989, and a permanent one in 1990. We are talking about TPQ. It was two years ago.

Mr. Murphy: Madam Chairman, in the same vein I would ask the member why it took the government two years to introduce this legislation. Obviously it has been an outstanding problem for a number of years because the injunction was received one and two years ago respectively. The fact that the government failed to act probably was the cause of the strike, which has only been going on for the last two months.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: Madam Chairman, I have followed the events for several years and every day for the last two years, and there was always the chance and the hope that the employers would come to an agreement. And after each ruling, the employees and the longshoremen would come to me and say: "Well, you win one, you lose one,

but things will finally be settled and we will be able to sit at the table." I think that is one of the reasons.

The other reason, without wishing to divulge what is coming in the future, is that these amendments were included in legislation which will soon be submitted to the House to amend various sections of the Canada Labour Code. Following the latest representations by the longshoremen at the end of the summer, I urged the Minister of Labour, the Hon. Marcel Danis, to take these amendments out of his bill amending the Canada Labour Code so that we might pass just those amendments without delay, thus avoiding a debate on other items with which the two opposition parties might not agree as rapidly as with this one.

[*English*]

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River): Madam Chairman, I apologize for being late this morning. I was running from Indian Affairs to Labour.

I would like to ask the parliamentary secretary to explain to me the portion of the bill which suggests that the board will now have the power to choose a representative on behalf of the employers if the representatives themselves cannot choose.

One of the things I was interested to know is that there is no suggestion of a time frame here. There is just a suggestion of an appropriate opportunity for the association to deal with that.

I would like to know how the government proposes to deal with that in a collective bargaining sense if the employers have difficulties coming up with a representative to deal with the collective bargaining agency which in this case is CUPE. Could you help me understand that?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague who was very co-operative on this issue, as I said before. Since the hon. member was not here, I would like to repeat what I said because in my opinion, Madam Speaker, this bill demonstrates—even if I cannot say that I fully agree with my colleague from the NDP—that when the three parties want to make things happen for the benefit of a part of the country, things do happen. I want to emphasize this for my colleagues from the two parties.