

Canada Labour Code

helpfulness at report stage. In going along with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) I should like to say that I believe the official opposition has one amendment and the government has three. Those could also be examined over the lunch hour. There is a purely technical amendment to clause 24, an amendment limiting review by the federal court which is clause 43, an amendment to expand access re remote locations, clause 71(1), and the fourth, a technical amendment to correct an error regarding first agreements made in committee in clause 62 on page 35.

If all those amendments that we intend to make and that we anticipate from the official opposition are accurate—and I have indicated what they are—as well as the amendments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and can be verified over the lunch hour, they can be handled with dispatch when we come back.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I want to say on behalf of my party that we are in agreement. I will be presenting one amendment which has been discussed with the minister, arising out of representations made to the committee by Miss Betty Garbutt whose sister was killed by a former employee who had threatened to commit violence and unfortunately was not stopped in time. The basis of this amendment has been discussed with the government, and I hope it will have the support of my colleagues in the New Democratic Party.

● (1242)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add to my suggestion of a moment that the consultations which will take place between now and two o'clock will have to be not only among members on the floor but also with the Chair and the Table. What seems to be developing is a substitution of three or four report stage amendments in place of the one which has been proposed by my friend from Nickel Belt. I think we are in unanimous agreement, and that all that is needed is consultation concerning the necessary paper work.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is very much aware of the point raised by the hon. member and is ready to cooperate. However, it must also comply with the standing order which can replace the 24-hour notice only by unanimous consent. I hope that hon. members can give that unanimous consent, and whatever agreement they see fit, when we come back at two o'clock.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is Friday; we can do it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed we call it one o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At 12.43 p.m. the House took recess.

[Mr. Munro (Hamilton East).]

● (1402)

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Prior to the lunch hour there was a disposition that during the short recess the minister and the members concerned would get together and suggest some motions at the report stage to replace the two motions that were in front of the House in the name of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). We have made great progress, but that is not quite complete.

In order not to waste the time of the House, and because we did not get from the minister a redraft of motion No. 1, in the name of the hon. member for Nickel Belt, if the House agrees I will stand consideration of that motion for the purpose of examining it later, or withdrawing it to be replaced with the newly worded motion which is being prepared at this time.

The House may agree to proceed in the order of the clauses of the bill. As we go along, we can dispose of motion No. 2, which also was in the name of the hon. member for Nickel Belt and will not need to be adopted because it will have been replaced by one of the other motions.

I have before me seven proposed motions, some in the name of the minister and two in the name of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser). These motions are achieving the purposes hon. members have accepted among themselves. Of course the Chair does face a difficulty arising from the fact that three of the motions go beyond the terms of the bill which is in front of us. At the same time, taking into account the disposition in the House to proceed all along on the basis of unanimous consent, it appears to me that the implications of these changes is not so fundamental as to prevent my accepting the motions as they are, provided we consider them by unanimous consent and, thereafter, make sure we follow the normal procedure.

● (1412)

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I believe what you have just been handling is the rework or Garbutt amendment to 81(3). We have had the lawyers working and we have just been handed that wording in place of the old draft. If it is thought satisfactory, I can move the amendments in consecutive order. I may say there is only one amendment outstanding. It is the one put forward by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) relative to "imminent danger".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to follow the procedure suggested by the minister?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As we go along, the minister will be moving the motions.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We agree to this but there is the understanding, of course, that if by the time we