

*Labour Dispute*

hours of overtime worked on regular working days are to be deducted from the 1,400 hours. At Trois-Rivières, the number of hours guaranteed is 1,200. Under the old contract it was 1,480 hours. We submit it is unfair to legislate the recommendations of the Gold report in terms of job security. We intend to ask the government to bring in amendments at committee stage to remove this unfairness and to do what was done in the case of the Vancouver settlement.

We can safely legislate the wage award because, as I say, it has been agreed to by both sides, though maybe not in writing. But as to the other matter, we should do as we did in the Vancouver case—provide for the appointment of an arbitrator whose decision would be binding on both sides. The parties could then go back to the bargaining table and work out a fair settlement in the area of job security, a settlement which the arbitrator would apply to both sides.

Argument will no doubt be put forward to justify the position taken by the government in supporting Judge Gold's conclusions as to the differential between Montreal, Quebec and Trois-Rivières. I do not question for one moment the competence or the ability of Mr. Justice Gold. He is probably the best man who could be found to undertake the task of conciliation. But one criticism I have of his report is that it seems to reflect the callous attitude of the Maritime Employers Association as it concerns the situation in Montreal vis-à-vis the situation in Quebec and Trois-Rivières. I say this in light of a statement which appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* of October 29 last. I quote the following paragraph:

"The port of Montreal is doing well and the other two are having difficulties," says one shipping agency president here. "Why should we pay for the others? Let each one stand by itself and if one port has trouble—well then, just close it."

● (1620)

I am sure that the people in Quebec City and Three Rivers will be glad to hear that from the president of one of the shipping firms in Montreal. But surely that kind of callous attitude and state of mind on the part of employers reflects to the detriment not only of the employees but also to the detriment of two of the major ports in the province of Quebec.

May I suggest, as one way to help resolve the difficulties that occur in our ports, that if you had a harbour or port authority which had authority to assign the loading and unloading of cargoes in terms of how many ships go where, when, and how often, there is no question that you could make certain that there was a sufficient level of shipping being handled at Three Rivers and Quebec City and there would be no difficulties. We know that as a result of the natural growth alone of the requirements of the port of Montreal, that port will do well anyway. Any harbour authority that would have control over what shipping is unloaded, at which port and how many vessels should be unloaded, I submit would make it unnecessary to have a differential of this magnitude between the long-shoremen at the three different ports.

Another point I want to make is this: I remind, as well as warn all hon. members of the House that when we legislate differentials like this among employees who do the same work, belong to the same union and work for the same employer, a differential that gives one section more

[Mr. Benjamin.]

than a second section, and that second section more than the third, we are doing nothing but asking for disruption, wildcat strikes and refusal to obey orders given the long-shoremen by their own officers, let alone the government and their employers. We will be compounding the felony if we legislate differentials of this nature between these three ports. We will be asking for a great deal more trouble within a matter of weeks or months.

Surely we can do better than this in legislation that is going to take away the right to strike and force these people back to work. As I said at the outset, we are not opposed to the principle of getting these ports opened and operating. But if we are going to do that, we must do it in a fair manner, a manner that does not abuse the people we are sending back to work.

We will have some suggestions to make in the committee. We will be moving amendments if the government does not, and I hope that members of all parties, particularly from the province of Quebec, will receive them with some sympathy. We should do no more than we did in regard to the situation at Vancouver harbour so we do not do violence, in an economic way or in the way of job security, to the men we are sending back to work.

There is another area I want to deal with. It is the issue that brought this matter to a head at the outset, as it did on Wednesday of last week. I refer to the movement of grain, particularly feed grain. In the emergency debate that we had, many questions were asked, I find it passing strange that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) is not here today. Neither is the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board (Mr. Lang).

With regard to the movement of wheat for export or feed grain, there need not have been, and there need not be today, any difficulty, though there may be some inconvenience. I am wondering why the Minister of Labour has not asked the Minister of Agriculture to instruct the Canadian Livestock Feed Board to implement plan C. I do not know whether all hon. members received this little leaflet which arrived in my mail this morning from the Canadian Livestock Feed Board, but any or all feed grain requirements of the province of Quebec can be met whether or not the ports of Montreal, Quebec City and Three Rivers are operating.

There are three alternatives for any buyer or user of feed grain in eastern Ontario and the province of Quebec when purchasing feed grain either directly in western Canada or through various companies. Plan C provides that the grain be shipped direct from country elevators to Granby, Quebec, for example, by rail. In fact, according to the Canadian Livestock Feed Board, when you deduct what you get under the Canadian feed freight assistance act from the total cost of moving feed grain by rail, the cost to the purchaser of feed grain amounts to 31¼ cents a bushel, which is fewer cents per bushel than if the grain is moved in the usual way, namely, from a country elevator to the terminal at Thunder Bay, then from the terminal at Thunder Bay by ship to Montreal, and then by truck from Montreal to, say, Granby, Quebec. Shipped this way, it costs 35 cents a bushel.

Plan B provides for shipping it by rail from country elevators on the prairies to the terminal at Thunder Bay, then by rail from Thunder Bay direct to consumers of feed