

Canadian Arsenals Limited

the very important debate on Bill C-87 which is before the House at report stage. The motion before us would require that the House give some time for contemplation, deliberation and reconsideration by the Government before the Act comes into effect.

I should like to seek some guidance from you, Mr. Speaker, in respect of the possibility of moving an amendment to the motion. Motion No. 4 reads:

This Act shall come into force after December 31, 1987, on a date to be fixed by proclamation.

I should like to amend the motion in such a manner as to ensure that when the NDP forms the federal Government, we will have an opportunity to review this carefully and to ensure that it will not be considered a *fait accompli*. Would it be in order to change 1987 to 1989? I would so move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), if that motion is in order. Would such a motion be in order?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): If the Hon. Member would like to move that type of motion, I would be glad to receive it in writing. Would he like to do it today or would he like to do it on Monday?

Mr. Robinson: I am sorry. What did you say, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am talking about your motion. Did you want to present me with a motion at this time?

Mr. Robinson: I would be pleased to write out the motion and present it.

Mr. Gauthier: In both official languages, please.

Mr. Robinson: I move:

That the motion be amended to change "1987" to "1989".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will accept it. Debate.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise on this amendment which would change—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member cannot speak now that he has moved the motion. I am afraid he is not allowed to speak.

Mr. Robinson: Why is that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): You just moved the motion, therefore you are not allowed to speak on it.

[Translation]

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I intend to deal briefly with the amendment which our colleague from Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) has just moved.

In fact, several of our colleagues who rose before me claimed that the Government needed a period of reflection in order to rectify some of the Bill's shortcomings. The Hon.

Member who suggested to give the Government until December 31, 1987 to think this thing over was certainly looking in the right direction.

However, according to the Hon. Member for Burnaby, it would seem that the Hon. Member would need two additional years to understand some of the problems—

Mr. Gauthier: They are slow on the uptake on the other side—

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):—of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main problems that the Government is having a hard time to understand is that the Canadian State may, as it pleases, sell off a Crown corporation. However, it does not seem fair to me for it to sell off at the same time the employees of the said Crown corporation. Yet, in a sense, that is what is happening.

The workers presently employed by Canadian Arsenals Limited have agreed under this Bill to concessions that are almost incredible in the labour movement. They have agreed to work for Surveyer, Nenniger & Chênevert (SNC), a firm, I am pleased to say, which has its head office in my riding, without being allowed to take along with them the union privileges they enjoy now. That is already a lot, and I suggest it is a major concession.

However, it seems to me that the Government is going too far in asking them to surrender also their established rights for a pension plan to protect their future financially.

That is why my colleague has moved an amendment, which may seem ridiculous at first sight, to replace 1987 with 1989. I understand that my honourable colleagues are saying: They want to stretch the debate. Let us be honest: Surely we want to stretch the debate.

I will say outright that it is not right what the Government is doing. Let us say it: it is downright unfair! That is why we oppose this and we will stretch the debate as much as we possibly can this afternoon. I give notice that we are going to stretch it until 5 p.m. That is what is taking place. Let us stop this peek-a-boo game. The Government should not treat this way the human beings who are working there.

Because this Crown corporation is sold to the private sector, something I do not oppose in principle—the State is not there to manufacture ammunitions—these people will be at the mercy of a boss working in the private sector, without any union protection. That is already a dramatic change. For the Government to ask these people to surrender their pension plan, I think, is going too far.

One of the amendments we discussed earlier was introduced by my colleague for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria). That was a reasonable amendment. However, it was not accepted, Mr. Speaker. We have trouble making the Government understand that, while we agree with the principle of privatization, there are certain things should be considered. We believe that certain aspects are unacceptable. I do not