

particular amendment provides for a chance to look at provisions for job security and should be supportable by all Hon. Members, and I so move.

The Chairman: The Chair does find the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East to be in order.

Mr. Cadieux: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the time of the House. I gave my arguments previously on the first amendment. I think they apply to the second amendment. Again, I just want to repeat that the terms of reference will definitely include that.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the arguments on the first amendment, as I understood the Minister, he could not agree to a provision for development of the port rail facilities' improvement of competitive position because it was outside the terms of the collective agreement. Quite clearly, the container issue, which is the one being put forward to the commission, includes a guarantee regarding the number of hours available to be worked on containers, so it is included in the container provision.

It is in fact a more stringent interpretation of the amendment. When the first amendment failed to come back, we decided on this one as it specifically relates to job security. Job security has a place within the confines of the collective agreement and surely the whole reason for the container issue is the question of job security for the workers. All we are asking is that in the context of this commission, among the other parameters and frames of reference set in the legislation as established, the Commissioner also be asked to look at provisions for job security. I do not see how this in any way is outside the jurisdiction of the collective agreement or the Larson Report because it was indeed in the Larson Report that reference was made to the minimum number of hours worked which translates in a certain sense to a kind of job security.

Amendment (Ms. Copps) negated: Yeas 10; nays 28.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, especially after the Minister complimented us on giving him copies of our proposed amendments in advance—he actually meant well in advance—he just received part of our, if you like, Plan B, which we always need to have because we want to ensure that we keep working on behalf of the people out there. Therefore, I move that:

Bill C-24, Clause 7(4), shall be amended by deleting line 6 on page 4 and substituting the following:

—by the Commission, however in no event shall the recommendation provide for a lower work guarantee than was recommended by the conciliation commissioner.

In brief, this establishes a bottom line. It says the commission cannot impose something which is less than what has already been recommended, nor can it negotiate below that point.

Maintenance of Ports Operations Act, 1986

Mr. Cadieux: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Hon. Member for giving me the amendment, notwithstanding that fact that it was not received well in advance. Because we also like to work for the people out there, I have given consideration to the amendment. I do not think it would be right to impose limits, whether bottom or top, in the inquiry, and I will let the commission make its own decisions.

The Chairman: The Chair finds the amendment to be in order.

Amendment (Mr. Angus) negated: Yeas 10; nays 28.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment concerning Clause 7 on page 4, to strike out lines 4 and substitute: “—appointed by the Minister, subject to the approval of the employers association and the union”. It seems to me that we are really making a very historical decision.

Ms. Copps: Historical blunder.

Mr. Foster: My colleague, the Hon. Member for Hamilton East, says it is a historical blunder, and only history will prove whether or not that is true. In any event, it seems to me that the Minister would want to appoint an industrial commissioner who carries the respect and the confidence of both the employer and the employees. Whether he does that by appointing a single commissioner or a group of commissioners, I think it is essential that both the employers association and the unions involved lend their support to this amendment. Therefore, I move:

That Bill C-24, an Act to provide for the maintenance of ports operations, be amended in Clause 7 by striking out line 4 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

“—appointed by the Minister, subject to the approval of the employers association and the union, for a final”

● (1630)

This amendment is a very simple one. It simply provides that the appointment of the Commissioner is subject to the approval of both the employers association and the unions concerned so that the final recommendation will be the most acceptable one by both the union and the employers association.

The Chairman: The Chair does find the proposed amendment to be in order.

Mr. Cadieux: Mr. Chairman, on this particular point, I would like to indicate to Hon. Members who are working so hard in committee this afternoon that these parties have not been able to agree on very much for the past 16 years. Unfortunately, I would not expect them to be able to agree on this either.

I would like to assure the House that in order to ensure that there will not be a blunder as someone has suggested, the best possible person or persons available will be appointed to head this commission. I am sure everyone will be very happy.