

Supply

spent equal time—although he suggested that it was all the time—attacking the provincial Government of British Columbia instead of attacking the federal Government for its irresponsibility in delaying the introduction of this legislation. I thought I had done that, Mr. Speaker, not only today in commenting on the miserable record of the Government in the last four years in this regard, but certainly I did so in the House of Commons a few days ago when I believe I used the phrase of CLC President Dennis McDermott, “sleazy Liberals”, referring to these people in the Government who act like Tories for four years and then sound like Liberals for a couple of months. And after saying that this legislation would be brought forward “in the near future”, the Government delayed it for three years, and we have finally received it in the last minute of the eleventh hour.

● (1650)

The Hon. Member was wondering, however, why I spent some time talking about the Conservative Government of British Columbia, and I would point out that it is composed of Socreds, Liberals and Tories. All one needs to do is to look at the signs which my Conservative opponent in Kootenay West had up on his lawn during the last election. They were Socred signs. They go to each other's nominating conventions. They are the same people. There is an old phrase with which I am sure the Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain) is familiar, that is, “If it acts like a duck, walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, chances are it is a duck”.

I ask the Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody this: In view of what has been happening in the current Labour Code amendments before the Legislature of the Province of British Columbia, in view of the number of right-to-work amendments to the Labour Code introduced by members of his own caucus in the House of Commons, and in view of what the Conservative administration of the United States has done in order to destroy individual workers' rights and attack the U.S. occupational safety and health administration, why should workers in Canada not say, “A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush, and regardless of the debate on C-34, regardless of the fact it could be better, let us get this legislation passed now so that fewer of us will die or be injured in the future”? Why should they not say that? I am used to cutting cards with the devil, but I will not hand the deck of cards over to him to do with what he wants. Who knows what the next election will bring.

Mr. St. Germain: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that as much as the Hon. Member will not recognize it, there were some people who were traditionally NDP, and perhaps still are, who voted for me, otherwise I would not have been able to win the election.

With respect to the Hon. Member's question, there is no doubt that if we cannot get amendments in a fairly short period of time, without delaying this particular Bill, our Party will accept what is there, as much as we would like to see many more amendments to the particular Bill. However, the fact remains that there is still one very big problem we are facing. I believe that the safety of the workers is the most

important aspect of this Bill, but I believe also, with respect to technological change, that we are getting very close to the point where we are not going to have any workers because there are not going to be any jobs. This is why we in this Party feel we should be addressing this particular aspect, as well as the matter of women in the workplace who are playing a more predominant role, and rightly so. I believe we must act when we have the chance, and the chance only comes once in every four years, and perhaps less frequently than that, and who knows who is going to be elected next. I am sure that we in our Party are going to be elected, and if we are, there will not be any problem. The Hon. Member can rest assured of that. We will look after all these things in a proper manner for the benefit of the working man. However, I can assure the Hon. Member that we will be expediting this Bill. We will not delay it unnecessarily.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): There is time for a short question.

Mr. Fulton: Yes, I have a very short question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know whether or not it is in fact the position of the Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody that he and his Party would not support this Bill going through in one day?

Mr. St. Germain: The three House Leaders, Mr. Speaker, to my understanding, have been in negotiation with respect to this.

Mr. Fulton: But where do you stand?

Mr. St. Germain: Where do I stand? I will be working to improve the Bill as much as we possibly can within a reasonable period of time and we will try to have it passed before June 30.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): That is the end of the ten-minute period for questions and comments. We will continue debate.

Mr. George Baker (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I will not be very long in my remarks because I would like to listen to the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) for at least 20 minutes or 25 minutes on a subject in which she has always been interested. My colleagues have addressed mainly the contents of the Bill which was introduced by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ouellet) on May 15. This legislation proposes to amend Parts III and IV of the Canada Labour Code. In addition, a number of the clauses contained in Bill C-34, an Act to amend the Canada Labour Code and Financial Administration Act, would amend Part V of the Code, the provision governing the conduct of industrial relations in federal jurisdictions. Like the other parts of Bill C-34, Mr. Speaker, these amendments are the product of lengthy and complex consultations with unions and employers under this legislation, and that of provincial jurisdictions.

I would like to discuss for a few moments the proposed changes to Part V of the Canada Labour Code, that is those changes dealing with industrial relations and the collective