

bargaining until such a time as our economic interests are jeopardized and then they will be sent back to work.

I have a number of constituents in my riding of Burnaby who are being ordered back to work as a result of the provisions of this bill. They are being told that if they do not work or if they engage in any form of work slowdown, the work to rule, for example, that is referred to in Clause 2, the federal Government may bring an application before the Federal Court for contempt of court. The implications that over 3,000 working men and women in the Province of British Columbia will be thrown into jail if they demand that this Government respect their fundamental freedom of association and not ram a settlement of six and five down their throats.

Is the Minister seriously asking this Parliament to pass legislation which tells these 3,000 men and women that unless they go back to work and work to full capacity they will be thrown in jail? It was pointed out earlier by the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway that this principle of free collective bargaining and the right to withdraw their labour, which through the provisions of Standing Order 43 we stand up and demand on behalf of trade unionists in Poland, should not be jeopardized. Yes, we are very free to speak up for trade unionists in Poland. But when it comes to trade unionists in the Province of British Columbia, they are being told to take a real cut in their standard of living.

At the same time the employer has been banking significant amounts of money each month on the assumption that an increase would be made which would keep up with the cost of living. A government conciliator has recommended an increase well beyond the so-called six and five formula. Is the Minister telling my constituents that they will go to jail if they tell him they are not prepared to accept this assault on their freedom of association?

**Mr. Caccia:** Mr. Chairman, I have every confidence that the men involved in this dispute will obey the law of the land as passed by this Parliament. As to the question raised by the Hon. Member that the men are being forced to go back to work, may I draw to his attention that we are dealing here with a lockout and not a strike.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Shall Clause 4 carry?

**Mr. Deans:** On division.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Could I at this stage say that we do not intend to put up any further speakers on this Clause. We do feel that the Committee should divide on the principle which the Hon. Member for Rosedale wants to put forward. He cannot put that amendment forward if Clause 4 is passed because the amendment is in direct conflict with Clause 4 as passed. The rule is quite clear that one cannot amend if that be the result.

I ask for the indulgence of the Committee to stand Clause 4 until my friend from Rosedale has the opportunity to put his

### *West Coast Ports Operations Act*

amendment which would add a Clause containing the collective bargaining agreement and amend Clause 5 to make the operation of Clause 4 subject to the intended new Clause 6.

**The Deputy Chairman:** The Chair has no difficulty with what the Hon. Member proposes. I did think another Hon. Member must be recognized, however.

● (1920)

**Mr. Kristiansen:** I have a very short supplementary question to the Minister about his earlier answer. In answer to that question as to whether Clause 4 meant six and five, or nine and six and five, the Minister said—I think I am quoting him relatively accurately—that it is his understanding that it will be 9 per cent to June 29 of 1982 then 6 per cent and 5 per cent for the appropriate periods after that. I believe the Minister is a good man, an honest and understanding man. However, I want more information, before I decide on a question like this, as to whether it is simply his understanding. Do I understand that it is a commitment of the Minister and the Government that what the Bill before us means is 9 per cent to June 29, 1982, then 6 per cent, then 5 per cent? Is that a commitment or an understanding?

**Mr. Caccia:** Mr. Chairman, I welcome the question by the Hon. Member. As I understand the Public Sector Compensation Restraint Act, the answer is that it would be 9 per cent in the first year and 6 per cent and 5 per cent in the two subsequent years.

**Mr. Kristiansen:** Is that what it means? Never mind the understanding. Is that a commitment; will you back that up with your office?

**Mr. Caccia:** It is my understanding of what the Act means, Mr. Chairman.

**The Deputy Chairman:** It is moved by the Hon. Member for Yukon that Clause 4 be stood. Is that the agreement of the House?

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Is there unanimous consent to stand Clause 4?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**The Deputy Chairman:** There is not unanimous consent.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am really surprised that the NDP would adopt that position—

**Mr. Deans:** What is the point of order?

**Mr. Nielsen:** —when we, as well as the Government, have already given the assurance that we have no intention of having any other Members speak on this side. We merely want to enjoy the democratic right of dividing on a principle. All that we want to do is have a vote. We cannot have a vote on