

### Government Orders

That Bill C-74, in Clause 6, be amended by deleting, in line 7, on page 3, the word "mediator-arbitrator" and replacing it with the word "parties".

The third amendment reads:

That Bill C-74, in Clause 8, be amended by deleting, in lines 30, 36 and 37, on page 3, the word "arbitrator".

The fourth amendment reads:

That Bill C-74, in Clause 8(2)(b), be amended by deleting, in lines 11 and 12, on page 4, the words "and render a decision in respect thereof" and replacing them with the words "and report to the minister".

The fifth amendment reads:

That Bill C-74, in Clause 8, on page 4, be amended by deleting paragraph (2)(c), paragraph (2)(d), paragraph (3)(b) and paragraph (4) and by deleting, in line 18, the word "arbitrator".

The sixth amendment reads:

That Bill C-74, in Clause 9, on page 4, be amended by deleting the word "arbitrator", in line 34, and by deleting all the words following the word "mediation", in lines 40 to 45.

The seventh amendment reads:

That Bill C-74, in Clause 10, on page 5, be amended by deleting the word "arbitrator", in lines 3 and 4.

The eighth amendment reads:

That Bill C-74, in Clause 11, on page 5, be amended by deleting after the word "provision", on line 17, all the words in lines 17 to 21.

● (2035)

Mr. Chairman, I already made a speech at second reading and those amendments reflect the proposals put forth during that speech. Consequently, I have nothing else to add and I will let other members speak on these issues.

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Chairman, the amendments submitted by the Bloc Quebecois, as I understand them, are meant to introduce a mediation system without arbitrators, without a timetable and without any indication of what would be done with the mediator's report.

I would simply like to remind the members of this House that when the conflict began in the western ports, the government followed all of the steps set out in the Canada Labour Code. The first step was to name a conciliator from the department's Mediation and Conciliation Service. This conciliator was named back in 1993 to help the parties negotiate with each other. Unfortunately, the conciliator achieved no real results.

Then, my predecessor officially named a conciliation commissioner. This action was taken back in October 1994. The commissioner worked with the parties for several months and submitted a report quite recently, in February 1995.

Therefore, I think that all of the possible mediation and conciliation steps to bring the parties to an agreement regarding

the collective agreement have already been taken. This is why I find myself obliged to tell the Bloc Quebecois that it would be extremely difficult for this government to accept its proposed amendments.

**Mr. Duceppe:** Mr. Chairman, our amendments clarify a number of points, including what should be done with the report. We suggest submitting the report to the minister. I assume that if the minister received a mediation report which involved the participation of both parties, she would know what to do, which means at least reading it and probably taking some kind of action. That was my first point.

Second, I realize there was an investigation commissioner, but the fact remains that special legislation has something urgent about it and is a major step in the process, and the parties would certainly take the mediator's proposals more seriously in the knowledge that the minister would subsequently receive a report which they had helped to draft and that the minister would be able to intervene, to take this report and bring the discussions and the mediator's proposals before the House.

So I think the basics are there. And if the minister wants to include a time limit in days in the amendments we are proposing, well, we would be happy to oblige if the minister is so concerned about that.

On the other hand, I must say that when we consider how this dispute developed, all the employer did was order a lock-out and 15 hours later we have special legislation. This tends to poison labour relations, and that is exactly what happened.

● (2040)

It should be pointed out that the union allowed grain movement and longshoring. It was management that interrupted these essential services which could be maintained under an anti-strikebreaking act. I disagree somewhat with my colleague from the NDP who said earlier that the Bloc Quebecois had made this emergency debate possible. I think it is important to debate this issue, even though we will be voting against this legislation.

I will remind him that, had his party held its own in the 1990 debate on anti-strikebreaking legislation, perhaps we would not be having this debate now. But the NDP did not do so in November 1990. Principles are one thing, actions are another and actions speak louder than words.

I think that, with our amendments, the hon. minister has enough material to take more significant action in this matter.

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member from the Bloc Quebecois misunderstood me. First, let me assure the House that, as Minister of Labour, I personally read each and every report I receive. Have no fear, if a report is sent to me, I will read it.