

Government Orders

I suggested in Committee of the Whole that they undertake a complete review of the geographic certification of that area and look at it in its entirety to see if there is the possibility or the necessity to change it somewhat to reflect the realities of the situation. When we take a look at how long this has been in place, which is since 1973, there can be and there probably are some significant changes that have taken place since then.

I want to suggest to the government opposite that we on this side approve of this particular piece of legislation in its entirety. We have some reservations and concerns as to just whether it will be as effective as it could be. We hope that we can resolve this issue for the men and women who are involved in the dispute.

We would ask that the House pass this quickly and that the the other place do the same. We will certainly do as the member has indicated. We will send the message to the Senate that we on this side of the House feel that there is no reason to delay the legislation. It should be passed as quickly as possible.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, I will start my very short remarks by sharing a concern that I think the Liberals and the government representatives alluded to and it is that we are asked in this House to rush the legislation because there is a perception of a need. At the same time we know that the Senate is not sitting today. We know that the Senate will not be sitting over the weekend. It will not be sitting Monday and the earliest that this legislation will be dealt with is on Tuesday.

I question how the government can get up and state that there is a need to pass this legislation quickly and at the same time not make any arrangements to have the Senate deal with the legislation.

I also find it ironic that where there is a situation such as a strike or a lock-out, this government normally will move very quickly in the perceived national need.

As was pointed out by the previous speaker, this problem has existed for a number of years. The employees have been without a collective agreement for seven years. The company that has refused to accept the Maritime Employers Association as the bargaining unit

for the employees has had injunctions in place over the last two years.

The strike itself has existed for 60 days. There did not appear to be any concern by the government on this issue until the last possible moment. In addition to that, when we were asking for government legislation last week this particular legislation was not even indicated as something that the government intended to deal with on Thursday or Friday of this week.

For that matter the discussions between House leaders earlier this week did not have this legislation down. You have to wonder where the government's priorities are and where the government's commitments are.

I congratulate the member for getting the legislation into the House but I think it could have been done better. I think that there is still going to be a sense among employees across this land that if it is legislation that works against their interests, this government moves quickly, but where there is legislation that works in the interests of the employees, this government does not move quickly. It moves very slowly.

Obviously the regular apparatus of the government through its House leader does not work in their best interests.

I would also like to raise the issue that was dealt with in Committee of the Whole. The fact is that there is nothing preventing the employer group that sought the injunction from trying to create further trouble in this particular instance.

There is nothing preventing that employer from seeking an injunction while it appeals its case before the Canada Labour Relations Board. Again as was mentioned in Committee of the Whole there is nothing saying that we will get a quick decision from the Canada Labour Relations Board. It may be put as a priority. It may not be. We do not know that.

There is an indication by the government member who spoke. He was the very member who has been pushing this bill. He hoped that this issue would be dealt with quickly but he did not believe that timetables should be put in place for a quasi-judicial board.