

*Private Members' Business*

selves as Canadians on a daily basis, on a monthly basis, on a yearly basis.

If and when we become dependent upon other nations to provide us with our daily bread then we are in serious trouble as a nation.

I think it is very important that with this Bill C-98, we have a new program in place to provide necessary financial insurance and assistance that stabilizes production for farmers to some extent. I also understand that this legislation involves considerable realignment of already existing programs. Although the existing programs will essentially remain the same, there is a realignment of programs, plus new programs to assist farmers. This is a substantial change.

One of the areas that does concern me about the legislation, and I only have a few minutes left, is the proposal to set up a special measures committee. I understand, from what the minister was saying today, that already there has been discussion about setting something up. But the legislation reads that "where the minister is of the opinion that exceptional circumstances exist that require that action be taken outside of the scope of the program established under this agreement, the minister may implement such procedures or other special measures as the minister considers necessary to determine the appropriate action to be taken", et cetera, under those circumstances.

I am also concerned, as one of my colleagues mentioned, that we really have an executive legislative type of authority envisaged by this particular measure in the legislation. I would hope that when this legislation goes to committee it can look at the nature and scope of this special measures committee and consider whether or not it is necessary right now, in fact, rather than waiting for the minister, at some distant point in time or now, to look at exceptional circumstances. Whether we should have a committee composed of those very people and groups involved in the creation of this proposed legislation that we have before us today; whether a committee comprised of those people should not, on an ongoing basis, from this point in time, be looking at this legislation and making recommendations to the ministry on particular changes to the legislation simply because the legislation is such a change.

I am sure that when the regulations are put in place and when the program is itself in operation that, no doubt, there will be some problems and glitches in the legislation that a committee should be looking at on a consistent, regular basis.

I feel strongly about this because I feel that it is a program, as I said at the beginning, that is in support of one of the most important facets of Canadian life and the Canadian economy and if it is a good program—and it appears to be substantially a good program—we want to ensure that nothing goes awry with the program.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member will have 14 minutes left, plus 10 minutes questions and comments.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's *Order Paper*.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

### CANADA LABOUR CODE

#### PRECAUTIONARY WITHDRAWAL FROM WORK FOR PREGNANT WOMEN IN FEDERALLY REGULATED BUSINESSES

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider including in the Canada Labour Code a provision for precautionary withdrawal from work for pregnant women working in federally-regulated businesses in Quebec and Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to address a matter of vital importance to pregnant workers in Canada and Quebec.

This particular issue caught my interest when members of my staff from Val d'Or and Senneterre received a complaint from a worker from Val d'Or who had applied to the Commission de la santé et de la sécurité du travail—better known as the CSST—in Quebec. The reply from the Rouyn-Noranda CSST was that the relevant Quebec legislation did not apply to federally regulated businesses.

My assistant, Ms. Françoise Lamarche from Senneterre who knows all the social cases in my riding, told me that the Canada Labour Code had a preventive function only. The Labour Code has no equivalent of precaution-