

*Maintenance of Ports Operations Act, 1986*

a very small fraction of the container traffic. There is enormous competition from Seattle and Tacoma to the south of us. I want to mention that these ports are very highly mechanized. The Port of Vancouver has only five cranes to handle containers, whereas Seattle has 21 and Tacoma has 10. We have only four container berths, whereas Seattle has 21 and Tacoma has 8. The growth rate to the south of us is pulling Canadian goods southward, not only goods from the Orient, because the American ports are better equipped. This is a major point of which we must be aware in this debate.

I do not think there is anybody in this House, and certainly very few Canadians, with the regrettable exception of the ship company employers on the West Coast, who want the Port of Vancouver closed down. This is a lock-out. It is a lock-out by employers who had a choice. Even if they chose to lock out the workers, they also had a choice to keep the grain from the Prairies moving at a very crucial time of the year. They have not used that choice. I am very concerned at the action taken.

We all want the Port of Vancouver to be working. We do not want it closed down. On the other hand, I am very concerned with Bill C-24 because it is not just legislation to make sure that the lock-out is removed and the Port is open and working while collective bargaining takes place. It is an arbitrary act which imposes a list of things that have been part of a contract, that are part of the Larson Report and are part of collective bargaining. I hope people will realize it is much more than just dealing with the immediate situation of getting the port working. That is why we felt it was very important. We could not possibly look at this Bill and automatically pass it without looking at the considerable ramifications contained within the Bill.

I would like to say also, speaking for my constituents, that they have faced enormous unemployment. The shipping has closed down, the lumber industry has closed down and jobs are disappearing all around us. I can be extremely sympathetic to the legitimate concerns of longshoremen. They really have to protect the jobs, unless they are sure that there are alternative secure jobs to replace some of the existing tasks they are performing.

If the container clause is removed, they will not have that security, unless the port is improved and there are real guarantees that there will be permanent jobs to replace those on the containers. Let us face it, Mr. Speaker, containers have to be emptied. It is not as though they did not have to be emptied. I like to point out that in the United States the container clause has recently been approved by the courts. It is not an unreasonable clause at all. I am not speaking for or against the container clause *per se*, but I am trying to present the position so that people will understand that workers in my riding are concerned about jobs. They want to make sure that there is some alternative if that clause is to be removed.

There are much greater problems affecting the port. I just gave a couple of examples that our own Crown corporations are contributing to the competition because they have policies

or want policies to ship Canadian goods through the United States.

The CNR is giving incentive rates to move Canadian goods south from Ontario through Chicago and to the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma. It is immoral and absolutely wrong that a Canadian Crown corporation should be doing that. Why should CNR not improve its service? It is a criticism of its service. CNR should be making competitive arrangements and upgrading its services here, including double-decker trains which are needed and are available in the United States to carry containers. We have a lobby also trying to change the Western Grain Transportation Act which will allow shipments of Canadian grain through U.S. ports. I cannot for the life of me see how this is in the interests of Canada. We have to make sure that that does not happen.

Bill C-24 has one provision which is to get the port working. This would have removed the lock-out. We never like this kind of legislation because it is arbitrary. Sometimes it is necessary. That part is not quite as bad as the other part. The part about which we are very concerned is that it imposes very arbitrary conditions on both parties. I am speaking for my constituents, so I will be biased. These conditions will have a serious impact on the workers. It overrules the collective bargaining process. It sets a precedent for other disputes. One cannot help but wonder whether this is the kind of tactic that the Government will use to impose settlements on other measures. My colleague has asked that if there is a safety concern, does it mean that there will be no chance of dealing with it?

The Government wanted to impose very complex legislation in one day. I hope it realizes now why it is still very important that all of us learn more about the implications and consult the various persons affected by it.

Clause 7 is a particularly bad clause. The Minister will appoint an Industrial Inquiry Commission to resolve the container clause. At first I thought maybe that was better than having it imposed by the Larson recommendations. On the other hand, one cannot help but wonder—and I hope the Minister will clarify it—who this commissioner will be. Will it be one person or several persons agreed upon by the parties concerned? How can all parties, particularly the workers in my riding, be assured that they will have an objective review? Will this person or persons be appointed in consultation with the parties concerned?

Subclause 13(2), as has been pointed out in questions already, is a most discriminatory anti-union clause. There is no question about it. It reveals the government philosophy. It states that the punitive measures can take a job away from a union officer for five years. There is no mention of taking a job away from the industry if it breaks the law. This shows again why amendments are so important.

As I say, I am speaking on behalf of my constituents. I make no apologies for that. They include more than longshoremen. They include grain workers, shore workers, warehouse workers, retail operators and their families who are very much