

shipping port as Vancouver. In today's *Globe and Mail* we read that MacMillan, Bloedell have stated that they will have to lay off 10,000 men unless once again pulp and pulp products start to go through that port. Here are two industries, the lumber industry and the grain industry, and one has to look only at the Canada Year Book to see that these two industries are at the top of the list in respect of our total exports. Perhaps in the last few years wheat has surpassed lumber, but here are two of the major exporting industries in Canada; both are tied up, and the minister says that he did not know just what to do. He said that he spoke to the Prime Minister last evening and that he hopes the house will have an opportunity to debate the matter so that perhaps someone will tell him what to do. He really does not know.

The whole country is crying for leadership in the labour field. The year 1966 will go down in history as one in which the government has shown no leadership whatsoever in labour conciliation or anything of that nature. We have had one strike after another, beginning as the minister said with the dockworkers at Montreal, Trois-Rivières and Quebec city, and then the St. Lawrence seaway. There has been no real leadership shown—unless the government wishes to assume that their action in giving a 36 per cent increase was leadership. Is this the only leadership they have to offer? It is a pretty weak excuse for conciliation, and is a pretty weak excuse for leadership in one of the main economic fields in this country. The government must manage its personnel and labour so that we have a reasonably smooth economic growth, and reasonably smooth production of the goods we have to sell.

In this case the government has failed miserably. In this particular instance the minister has shown a complete lack of leadership even in recognizing the fact that here we had an obvious instance where a mediator should have been appointed three weeks ago so that the grain would not have been allowed to back up into the prairies, and so that no harm would have been done to the largest segment of the lumber industry in Canada. Because of the lack of action we now are in the position that unless pulp products begin to move immediately 10,000 men will have to be laid off. The minister is in some doubt as to what action he should take. I urge him to go out there and if both sides tell him to go home, then I suggest that he should appoint a mediator who is capable of getting along with, and

Pacific Coast Longshoremen Dispute

is acceptable to, both sides. He should appoint this mediator and urge him to bring the two sides together and if necessary say to them, "We will amend the act. We cannot afford this tie-up; we are prepared to show leadership, and we will change the Canada Labour Code if necessary. We will change the Canada Labour Relations Board if necessary, because we want this very important port to function at top speed and at top efficiency." I urge the minister to take action in this regard.

Mr. Laing: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Certainly.

Mr. Laing: I am quite certain the hon. member would not wish his remarks to be interpreted as being a criticism of the efficiency of the port of Vancouver or the labour there. If so, I think I could convince him that over the years at this port we have had the most efficient labour and highest use of capital investment for the handling of freight. I would hope the hon. member would agree with that.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Certainly I have no complaint to make concerning the efficiency of the labour, but in order to do the job efficiently you must have the tools. The Vancouver port is not working and has not worked efficiently. All one needs do is take a look at the proceedings of the committee on transport and communications, and the remarks of a witness representing the National Harbours Board who appeared before that committee. He mentioned that a great deal of modernization would have to take place to bring about the efficient operation of the port of Vancouver. Certainly the minister, who is from British Columbia, as well as other hon. members, should know that the port of Vancouver in many instances is poorly organized. The transportation into the port is poorly organized and the handling facilities at that port in many instances are poorly organized. One only has to look at the records of the transport and communications committee to be assured of this.

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I feel that the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke (Mr. Johnston) in moving this motion to adjourn the house had done a decided service to parliament and I hope, if the government takes effective action, a decided service to the country, because he has brought about an opportunity to discuss not only the tie-up at British Columbia ports but also