

matters of the House at this very moment. However, the delivery of grain to our customers in other nations is essential to the well-being of our grain producers and to all components of our grain transportation system.

It is unfortunate that the net cast by the parties to this dispute is so widespread as to include grain-loading operations in B.C. ports. Hon. Members will recall the earlier remarks of the Minister of Labour in which he indicated the critical difficulty in the dispute between the B.C. maritime employers and the longshoremen as being the resolution of the container clause. That clause concerns the packing and unpacking of containerized cargo.

The transference of grain to ships at docks is conducted in bulk by a conveyer spout from the grain elevators and certainly bears no resemblance to container cargo, as we have heard before. Yet a primary issue in dispute has precipitated a course of action by the parties which reflects a disregard for the importance to the local and prairie economies of an interrupted flow of export grain. Nevertheless, all Members of the House should recognize the candid assessment given by the Minister of Labour on the container issue, which has been in contention for some years, and the fact that it warrants the special attention of an industrial inquiry commission. The difficulty the parties have had in resolving the complexity of this issue warrants a full opportunity to present their points of view to a skilled commission.

I might add that in the creation of this Bill there was certainly no limitation on how the parties can enter into drawing a conclusion to the situation. The provision is there, but the Minister has placed some time limits on when he expects them to come to an agreement. If that is not possible then a referee will be put in place to arrive at a solution.

The Minister has given serious consideration to the resolution of this dispute and has chosen a course of action which is fair to both parties. Passage of the Bill before us must be viewed by all parties as being fair to all sectors affected by the dispute. Hon. Members of the House should be aware of the Government's commitment to the role of collective bargaining and its adherence to the belief that the constructive settlement of disputes through meaningful negotiations can take us further as a society in pursuit of the common well-being.

Part V of the Canada Labour Code places the prime responsibility for the resolution of labour-management disputes on the parties to collective bargaining and provides them with third-party conciliation assistance to aid them in difficult circumstances in the resolution of their differences through the bargaining process. In rare instances, as is the present case, the Government must intervene to prevent the parties to the dispute from inflicting irreparable damage to the public interest and to the economy.

I have given Members of the House some of my reflections on the more salient dimensions of the grain export industry, particularly as it relates to our export markets and the prairie economy. The measures contained in the Bill are intended to

accomplish an immediate resumption of port operations, which is of vital importance to the people affected by the disruption of the port. The Bill will also impose the terms of the report of Conciliation Commissioner Dalton Larson, which is a reasonable and fair compromise on the issue in dispute and allow for a comprehensive study of the sensitive container clause.

I urge Members of the House to support the Bill and to work toward its passage without delay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Are there questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton).

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear the Hon. Member's views with respect to Clause 13(2) which provides that punitive actions can be taken against union officers and representatives of the union. They can be denied the right to be employed by the union for five years following any conviction under the punitive section. Does the Hon. Member agree that this subclause should be removed? Does he think that the same type of punitive measures should be taken against company officials and company officers or their affiliates in similar situations?

**Mr. Belsher:** Mr. Speaker, if one reviews the history of the operation of the ports in British Columbia and looks at the various times there have been disputes caused by both sides of the issue, I think the Hon. Member will agree that there has to be some teeth in this legislation. I appreciate the Hon. Member asking whether or not both sides should be part of this situation. I think that there should be something provided for both sides. I would support such an addition to the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

● (1650)

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### DISPOSITION OF BILL C-24

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Subsequent to earlier discussions with regard to the process for the expeditious passage of Bill C-24, there were discussions with the representatives of the two opposition Parties, and those discussions have concluded. I think, Mr. Speaker, you would find that there would be unanimous consent to adopting the following proposal:

That the business to be considered between 5.00 o'clock p.m. and 6.00 o'clock p.m., this day, shall be the continuation of consideration of Bill C-24, an Act to provide for the maintenance of ports operation;

That on Tuesday, November 18, 1986, when Government Orders have been called, the Order of the Day shall be consideration of Bill C-24;

That, not later than 4.45 o'clock p.m. on that day, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt any proceedings then before the House, and shall put forthwith, without further debate or amendment, all questions necessary to dispose of all of the remaining stages of Bill C-24;