

Maintenance of Ports Operations Act, 1986

crop of grain. Also waiting trains could continue to unload their cargo into B.C. grain elevators for future shipment to Pacific Rim destinations.

I think the Minister wants a positive resolution of the situation so that there will not be undue bitterness in the future. I urge him to consider seriously an amendment which would help resolve the lock-out and would allow the few longshoremen who work on the shipping end of grain to resume their work.

We all deplore the lock-out imposed by the British Columbia Maritime Employers Association which closed down the operations of the port. It is always very unfortunate when such a thing happens. Apparently it was a tactic to try to force an imposed settlement of the contentious grain container clause, which involves only a small aspect of port operations. Only a very few longshoremen handle grain on the ships, and they have always been willing to continue grain handling during disputes.

Again I ask the Minister to consider the amendment. It would allow time for other aspects to be resolved and it would keep our grain moving. We believe that Bill C-24 takes away the rights of workers and imposes a contract which I do not think is agreeable to either party.

Mr. Cadieux: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few comments on the proposed amendment and on the points raised by the Hon. Member for Vancouver East and by other Hon. Members who spoke this morning.

I do not want to repeat the speech I made yesterday. It was a relatively long speech which outlined the history of the negotiations between the two parties involved. Everyone knows that their bargaining record is a dismal one. The reason that we are dealing with the Bill today takes that into consideration.

This Act may be cited as the Maintenance of Ports Operations Act, 1986. I should like to answer certain concerns by quoting from my speech. As reported in *Hansard* at page 1231, I said:

In addition to the damage which a lengthy work stoppage would cause to Canada's reputation as a reliable exporter of grain, the business community and its employees dependent upon water transportation for shipment of their goods and resources, are also subject to undue hardship as a result of this work stoppage. We are once again faced with a situation in which the parties to a dispute are able to inflict more punishment on others than on themselves.

Therefore we will not support the amendment.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Chairman, I seek clarification of the Hon. Member's amendment. As I read it, it would reinstate grain handling operations but would not reinstate the handling of minerals such as potash from Saskatchewan, other minerals from British Columbia or lumber from British Columbia and Alberta. Would it strictly reinstate grain handling operations but not the handling of the other major resource commodities of Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia?

Mr. Angus: Mr. Chairman, I should like to respond quickly. Clearly the intention was to focus upon grain. That seems to be from where public pressure is coming; to my knowledge, there has not been an overwhelming cry about the other sectors. It has been indicated that if we are to allow for the collective bargaining process, we cannot leave one element working in the system. Both sides must have flexibility to take whatever stands or use whatever tactics are appropriate from their perspective in order to try to reach a collective agreement.

• (1540)

We have conducted a very narrow focus on the grain sector to allow it to get back to work. It is a very small component in terms of the members of the union. It is a very small component in terms of the companies involved. I think if Hon. Members look at Schedule I they will see that there is only one company listed that would be covered by this clause. I refer to the association of terminal operators. All the rest of the companies would be left out, allowing the collective bargaining process to continue.

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Amendment 1(A) (Mr. Murphy) negatived: Yeas, 11; nays, 56.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Just so that everyone is clear as to what we are doing, there are three additional amendments that relate to the same matter of substance and we will not be moving them. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Regina West, will move the next amendment on our behalf.

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

On Clause 6—*Terms, etc., of agreement amended.*

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to move with respect to Clause 6. I move:

That Bill C-24 be amended in Clause 6 by deleting lines 40, 41, 42, and 43 on page 3 and substituting the following:

"—1986, other than the recommendations contained in the report concerning Articles 12, 13, 14, 16, 19.08, 21.03(1), 26.05 and 28.01(1) of the agreement."

Mr. Chairman, I will be quite frank, open and honest with the Minister. The purpose of this amendment is to comply with a request by the union to switch the location in the legislation of where items in the collective agreement will be decided upon and be binding on both parties by a referee, that it be done by the industrial Commissioner or the commission. These items have to do with pensions, the welfare plan and a host of other items. It is felt that since they are subject to binding decision in any event one can now assume, although it is a risky assumption, that the two parties will continue their collective bargaining from now until the end of 1988, as is specified in