

Government Orders

(4) How is Treasury Board going to enforce these restraint measures on staffs of MPs?

(5) Does Treasury Board have or will it seek the authority to examine the rates of pay for staff of MPs and senators?

Mr. Loiselle: We will send CSIS.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): The minister jocularly says: "We will send CSIS". Yes, they just may. Lord knows there is ample precedent for it.

(6) Is not this bill more than back to work legislation but a back-handed way for the government to introduce restraint measures it does not want to or cannot through separate legislation?

(7) Does the minister not find a touch of irony in the fact that the RCMP and military, the very people expected to control angry workers who are on the picket lines, now find themselves swept up in the same legislation?

(8) Why, given that the government spends in excess of \$5 billion a year on contracting out, would the government exclude independent contractors from the restraint measures of the act?

(9) How many individuals are affected by this exclusion and what is the cost of these contracts?

(10) How much does a lawyer on contract to the government earn?

(11) Why would that lawyer be excluded?

(12) How much does an architect on contract to the government earn?

(13) Why would that architect be excluded?

(14) How much does a temporary staff person in a clerical position earn?

(15) If a public sector worker under the PSAC contract is working next to an independent contractor doing the same work, why would the independent be excluded?

(16) Does the independent contractor earn a different rate of pay?

(17) Why are federally appointed judges excluded from the bill?

(18) Does this bill apply to compensation received by the Governor General?

(19) Does this bill apply to the Bank of Canada?

With those questions on the record, I shall defer now to my hon. colleague, the member for Saskatoon—Dundurn.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: It is up to the chairman to give the floor. The hon. member for Saskatoon—Dundurn.

Mr. Ron Fisher (Saskatoon—Dundurn): Mr. Chairman, I believe the member for Portneuf, if I can remember correctly where he was sitting and if he is still in the House, strenuously defended all these people he was enumerating who were laid off in his constituency and those who are unemployed. The opposition, and in particular the NDP, certainly did defend those people.

Do you forget the debate on free trade? Why on earth do you think those people are unemployed? Why do you think they have been laid off from their jobs? Why do you think those people have been laid off? They have been laid off because of the free trade agreement and the companies they have worked for have moved south of the border. That is why they are unemployed. That is why they are losing their jobs.

In any event, this debate is not about fighting the deficit. I submit to you that the deficit is a very fortunate turn of events for this government. It gives it the opportunity to be able to do something. The question was asked and I made the answer. I think I received the answer to that about nine months subsequent to asking the question.

This is not about a large deficit and it is not about wage restraint either. This debate is about wage suppression. What a marvellous opportunity to bring in legislation, and there is no question whatsoever that this government has not bargained in good faith with these people from the moment the budget was brought in, a budget that brought in by law a constraint on the government's employees which guaranteed with the majority the government had that there was no way fair bargaining could possibly take place. Fair bargaining was pre-empted the moment that the finance minister read the budget, and there is just no question about that.

Turning to the deficit itself, I do not know who requested the survey or the study that Statistics Canada did. It is one of the most reputable adjuncts to the