

something particularly to my good friend, the hon. member for Mississauga South.

It seems to me there is something we are forgetting in the arguments that have been made from all sides on this legislation, that is employees, whether they are management, working staff, those on commissions and whatnot, should be the lenders of first resort and have first priority in compensation in the event of a bankruptcy or being forced into receivership.

I want to remind my colleagues that employees, whether in management, on the production line or on commission, lend their physical presence, lend their minds and lend their labour in the production of whatever the company is producing. What they have lent is only repaid as and when they receive their salary, wages or commission. That is why I want to submit that these people in a company in bankruptcy, large or small, are the lenders of first resort.

The institutional lenders, the financial institutions, shall be next in line. There is the case of the suppliers who I believe should have the right under a receivership or a bankruptcy to enter a premises and take back any of the unsold product that was sold to the company but had not been paid for. It should also apply to any unpaid holiday pay, expenses that are eligible for reimbursement and sick pay. They should all be included because they are part of the costs of labour. They are included in the total cost of a labour package of any corporation. I just wanted to say that the employee of a company that has gone into bankruptcy is just as much a lender as any bank or other financial institution. If he has not been paid for the labour he put in, then he should have first priority on the recovery out of either any cash that is on hand or any assets that will be sold. They should be first in line before anyone else.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley, the hon. Associate Minister of Defence said earlier that she would like to come into the House and report on the air crash in the Arctic.

Is it agreed that the hon. minister will have an opportunity to report?

An hon. member: Revert to statements by ministers.

Government Orders

An hon. member: Will we get back to debate?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Yes. I have to recognize the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley for debate after. The hon. government Whip.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, in terms of order, I am not sure whether the entire House would like to see this matter disposed of in the sense of a voice vote which would then incur a referral until Monday at six o'clock.

I believe there are about 13 minutes left in the normal time.

An hon. member: There are four minutes left.

Mr. Hawkes: There are four minutes left. If that is not the predisposition of the House, should we maybe just take a minute and do the voice vote and get rid of that item, then have the minister's statement? I just raise the question.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I think we are going to run out of time. I know there is at least one other speaker and unfortunately he will not have time to complete his remarks. Perhaps the best thing to do would be to simply call it 3.29, which is the end of the debate period, and then move directly to ministerial statements.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it agreed?

An hon. member: We will agree to let him finish his remarks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is whatever the House would like me to do. Shall I ask the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley to complete his remarks, or start debate and I will cut him off in two minutes? The hon. government Whip.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can be helpful. I am not sure what my hon. colleague was saying. If we wanted to go on for 10 minutes after the remarks of the minister of Defence to allow the completion of the remarks and dispose of the item, I think there would be a large majority of the House quite prepared to do that. If they do not want to dispose of the item today in terms of bringing it to vote, that clarity would help us and then the suggestion of calling it 3.29 would be appropriate.

If we need more time for debate on this bill on another day, that is one thing. If all we need is 10 more minutes, I think the House would unanimously agree to complete those 10 minutes and then vote.