

which may be helpful. I will, of course, advise the Hon. Member and others when I will render a decision. Perhaps I can contact Hon. Members about that later. I want to thank all Hon. Members for their interventions. The Chair has found them all to be very helpful.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the House a notice of a question of privilege raised by the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm). The Hon. Member for Peterborough does not wish, as I understand it, to argue the case today, but wishes to be assured that there has been no delay which would prevent the Hon. Member from bringing his question of privilege to the Chair. I want to assure the Hon. Member that I consider this to be a valid notice, and when it is appropriate for the Hon. Member to raise the matter in argument, as I understand it is important and complex, that will be arranged.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I appreciated the remarks that were made. I was trying to rise to catch your eye, Mr. Speaker. Here under the shadow of the clock, it is sometimes a little difficult to catch someone's eye.

There is one other point I would like to mention which no other Hon. Member mentioned. The House Leader made mention of reflections on the work of a committee. We can see what happens to the House when that happens, but you have taken that into consideration, Mr. Speaker.

There was another point made under Standing Order 59 that was to me equally germane to the issue, and that is that there is not to be a reflection on a vote taken in the House, *mutatis mutandis*, under the rules. That also applies to committees. Even with the sincerity that exists and because of the new ground being broken by committees, something which should be left to the committees, we can see the procedural wrangle we can get into. No matter how well intentioned is a point which comes to the floor based on a vote of a steering committee, let alone an entire Standing Committee, the whole place bogs down. Standing Order 59 which says that no Hon. Member may reflect on a vote in the House applies equally, I would suggest with the greatest of respect, to the committee.

I am not going to deal with the argument of my good friend from Windsor. He must be a little tired as he heads into the last of the month. He made a very interesting argument. The angels on the head of pin had more vitality than the conviction in his voice. Nowhere in Standing Order 103(1) is there anything about a steering committee. It is the committee itself and that is what we all know is the committee—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley—Hants (Mr. Nowlan) has contributed to the debate and I shall take into account his comments. Certainly all Hon. Members will agree that this place cannot be used endlessly and continually to settle all matters that take place in committees. However, the Chair has indicated that it is my view that this is an important matter. As I say, I hope I will be able to make a

Maintenance of Ports Operations Act, 1986

ruling which will be of assistance to all Hon. Members and to the committees.

● (1530)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

MAINTENANCE OF PORTS OPERATIONS ACT, 1986

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-24, an Act to provide for the maintenance of ports operations—Mr. Cadieux—Mr. Danis in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose for the luncheon break, Clause 3 was under discussion and an amendment had been proposed by the Hon. Member for Churchill. Therefore the question is on the amendment.

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on NDP amendment No. 1(A). The Government has said all along that its main concern about the lock-out of West Coast longshoremen is in the area of the stoppage of grain shipments from the Prairies. We share that concern. There has never been any question about it. I hope it is the priority of every Hon. Member of the House.

Why did the Government choose such a broad shotgun approach to this piece of legislation? It affects all operations, removes collective bargaining rights and imposes a contract. Why could we not have legislation to deal with the movement of grain and to provide for ways to deal with the other disputes?

Therefore our amendment asks the Government to be specific and to apply this piece of legislation to the handling of grain rather than to all port activities.

An article which appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press* referred to prairie farm groups and grain companies which were demanding that Ottawa prevent a planned lock-out this week of West Coast ports, thereby shutting down half of Canada's export capacity. Mr. Moore, the general manager of United Grain Growers, said: "We want them to leave grain alone. If that does not work, we will be going to the Government". That is history now, but it is unfortunate that the British Columbia Maritime Employers Association refused to exempt grain from the lock-out. The longshoremen have stated publicly a number of times that they would work the grain.

The amendment before us would delete "longshoring and related operations at ports on the West Coast of Canada" and substitute therefor "all grain handling operations at ports". The effect of the amendment would be to require employers to lift the lock-out of workers in grain operations. The workers could return to work. The gates at the Port of Vancouver would be opened as would the gates at the grain elevators. Then waiting ships could be loaded with this year's abundant