

thing. I notice there is no talk of embargoing anything produced by their pals in big business. Perhaps the saddest thing is to see how easily the members of the Liberal and Conservative Parties are willing to give up basic human rights and basic rights of workers. I know we are in difficult economic times, but the vicious attack on workers by the Liberals and Conservatives are destroying rights it took 100 years to build.

• (1600)

The saddest fact is that even in simple economic terms, these kinds of actions were unnecessary and just plain stupid. What does the Government think is going to happen if it legislates those workers back with a bad contract? What do you think those workers will do when they see the companies making giant profits and they know none is being passed on to them?

The Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Clark) was so anxious to see the workers legislated back that he stood up in this House and unequivocally stated: "Get the bill on and we will pass it through in a hurry without even seeing the legislation". That is the kind of concern the Conservative Party has for the working people and grain growers of Canada.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) spent three nights on national television whining about how everybody was responsible for our problems and talked a lot about productivity. I can show him an example of productivity, Mr. Speaker. Last year there was a two-week labour dispute in the grain facilities in Thunder Bay. The two sides in that labour dispute settled their differences. They were permitted to do so without the Government stepping in on the side of the employers. There was, of course, some loss of shipping because of the dispute. At the end of the seventh week of the shipping season last year, only about 24,000 cars had been unloaded in Thunder Bay, compared to about 44,000 the year before. This is a lot of grain. But by the end of the 20th week the 20-car unloading shortfall had been made up. By the end of the year the port had moved 17.1 million tonnes as compared to 15.0 million tonnes the year before. That shows that with co-operation between labour and management, they can and will do the job, and will meet the needs of all of us across Canada.

My party, Mr. Speaker, is opposing this legislation not because we do not want the grain to move at the docks; we oppose it because it is stupid legislation that in the long run will only make sure that labour relations on the west coast docks continue to fester. We oppose it because it is another patchwork solution to a problem that requires a long-term solution. Most of all, we oppose it because it is another vicious attack on working Canadians by people who cannot understand there is a difference between power and leadership.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Is the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) rising to contribute to the debate?

**Some Hon. Members:** Filibuster.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker. I find it very interesting that the bill was introduced less than an

### *West Coast Ports Operations Act*

hour ago, I am the second speaker for our party, and we hear from Hon. Members to my right that this is a filibuster. We have before us a House order saying that this Bill will be passed before we adjourn. For them to now say that we cannot speak shows what they think of democracy in this country. Yesterday in this House the Leader of that party got up and said: "We'll pass the legislation. We don't have to see the legislation; we will pass it today. We don't care what the Government presents, we will pass it."

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that one of the Members of the Conservative Party does not believe that is what the Hon. Leader said. Perhaps he was one of those 24 Conservatives who were not in the House the night before, and he was not here yesterday as well. I quote the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark), who said as reported at page 20280 of *Hansard*:

We on this side of the House would be prepared to deal today with legislation brought in today, and to deal with it in all stages.

This is important legislation. As somebody who represents Churchill with its port facilities, as somebody who comes from a Province which depends very much on the economic contribution of agricultural regions, I recognize the importance of this legislation. But I do not want to see this House railroaded by either the Government or the Official Opposition into passing legislation that is a mistake. The previous speaker, our labour critic, pointed out the very real danger that exists if we pass this legislation now. He pointed out we are creating trouble for ourselves and for people who will depend upon the grain handling facilities in this country in the future.

This Government, through a bill which is supposed to be introducing back-to-work legislation, is sneaking in its six and five régime. We are not asked just to order people back to work; we are being asked to again approve an extension of the Government's six and five program.

Normally, what happens in a dispute of this nature is that the Government will look at the conciliator's Report and will use it as the basis of any imposed settlement. It may not take the exact pay scale or the exact items that are listed in that report, but will use it as the basis of any imposed settlement because the conciliator was there to hear from both sides, to study the economic situation of the company, the situation of the workers and the comparable contracts of people working in similar jobs. So that a conciliation report, at least in some respects, is a realistic report. It is a report which may not be liked by either party, but it is probably much closer to what is really needed to ensure that we have peace in the future.

The Government, through its dogmatic insistence on imposing the six and five régime, is asking for trouble in the future, not only in terms of grain handling, but with respect to workers doing similar work in other parts of Canada.

• (1610)

There is another aspect to this legislation, this sneaking in of the six and five, which must be considered. That is that every