developing inter-modal connections. Seattle, for example, has spent US $35 million on terminal improvements just to keep one major customer, American President Lines.

One only need refer to the chart provided in the same background document to see the problems we are having in the development of ports in British Columbia, including those of Vancouver, Prince Rupert, Stewart, Kitimat or any on the Fraser System. The political intervention in our system includes the federal Cabinet, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie), Transport Canada, the Canada Ports Corporation Board of Directors, the Vancouver Port Corporation Board of Directors and finally the Port Manager and staff. There is this incredible bureaucracy, and of course those at the port level are all at this time appointed Conservative hacks.

The situation in Canada is not the same as the typical situation in a western U.S. port. The political intervention in that system begins with city council and goes to city officials, the port itself which is a public corporation, the Board of Harbour Commissioners, the executive and staff and then the actual seaport landlord. There is a much more direct chain of command for any borrowings required to develop the port.

I would like to deal with whether or not containers will come back to Vancouver because I think that is the key that has been misunderstood in this debate. I have touched on my concerns over Clause 13(2), and I think the Minister has agreed in principle that, although he will not take the clause out as it applies to unions, he is prepared to apply it evenly to corporations as well as the union. It is a saw off. I would prefer to see Clause 13(2) dropped.

Regarding the industrial inquiry commission, the commissioners and the final terms of reference, I am hopeful that the Minister will, later today, come to some kind of agreement on an amendment or procedure to see that fair-minded and unbiased people who are agreeable to the positions of both the ILWU and the MEA are chosen. This will provide for a process that will work and will be satisfactory in its conclusion. I think it is very important that whoever is chosen from Labour Canada to be the referee exercise great caution in providing contractual language so that it is acceptable and can be lived with by both sides in the dispute.

Let me wind up with something about containers which is not fully understood. I am quoting again from the union background document under the heading "Will The Containers Come Back To Vancouver?"

About 92,000 containers will cross the border from the ports of Seattle and Tacoma to Vancouver in 1986. Fifty thousand of these containers will be landed in the American ports by ships that also call at Vancouver (Dual Callers). If the longshoremen would only give up their container clause, so the critics argue, the shippers and freight forwarders would drop those 50,000 containers in Vancouver. The increased work would more than offset the 12,000 containers which the longshoremen currently unpack as a result of the container clause.

Then there are another 42,000 Vancouver-destined containers shipped to Seattle on lines that do not stop in Vancouver. Opponents of the container clause argue that a portion of these would be off-loaded in Vancouver as well.

So giving up the container clause should mean more work for Vancouver longshoremen, not less. The increased volume of containers moving through the port of Vancouver should more than make up for the loss of work unpacking a small number of containers. Why won't the Longshoremen's Union give up the clause?

Quite simply, there is no guarantee whatsoever that the containers presently diverted to Seattle and Tacoma will come back to Vancouver.

The Ports of Seattle and Tacoma will do whatever they can to keep those containers flowing through their ports. The Port of Seattle will be "very responsive to whatever Vancouver does if they are successful in removing their container clause," says Seattle Port Manager Ross Dwyer. Their track record indicates they have been very successful in attracting business because of their aggressive marketing approach. An example is Seattle's promise to install three cranes with longer gantries to handle the new wider-body vessels ordered by American President Lines—each vessel can carry 3800 TEUs—even before these ships have been launched.

Vancouver, in contrast, has done little to get a larger share of the business or even keep what it has.

So far, there has been no indication that the Vancouver Port Corporation is prepared to change. The current strategy seems to be "get rid of the container clause and keep your fingers crossed."

I know that farmers across Canada are greatly concerned about the movement of grain, as are people in Vancouver. The over-all amount of merchandise coming into the Port of Vancouver for off-loading destined for areas throughout Canada and the number of commodities going out through Vancouver, Prince Rupert, the Port of Stewart and other ports clearly means that we must come to some kind of an acceptable process designed to get the collective agreement process moving again.

I can only say about the container clause that there seems to be a degree of acceptability both on the part of the ILWU and the MEA, but I would urge the Minister to move much more cautiously in the referee process and the industrial inquiry commission process regarding the appointments that are made and the terms of reference. Particularly, I would urge him to gut the anti-union signals he has so clearly entrenched in Clause 13(2) which provides that sanctions may be taken against unions and their officers with no similar provision for action to be taken against Maritime Employees Association companies. At least to this point in time, those are the ones who have been the dogs in the manger.

We are talking about a lock-out by the employers. This is not a strike by the workers. The workers have made it clear all along that they intended to continue to move grain and other commodities without any work stoppage whatsoever. They are the ones who have been the good operators. The MEA has brought this matter to the point where the House of Commons had to deal with it rather than the collective bargaining process.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Hon. Member has the same concern as our Party about the clause in the Bill which provides for the industrial commissioner, that is, that the clause is drawn too narrowly. It refers only to the container clause and does not deal with the concerns the workers will have with regard to job security, the development of the port, the development of rail facilities and improvement in the competitive position.

The B.C. Maritime Employers Association is arguing that there will be an additional 80,000 containers going through the