

a substantive amendment to the interpretation clause. I cannot accept that amendment by virtue of 773(10) of *Beauchesne*. Therefore, I must rule the amendment out of order.

On Clause 2, the Member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan.

● (1240)

Mr. Angus: Mr. Chairman, if I might discuss your ruling, on a point of order, he has indicated that it was basically concluded, so how can it be substantive?

The Chairman: The Chair has ruled on the proposed amendment, and of course the Chair must stand by its ruling.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Chairman, I rise to seek further clarification. Perhaps the Minister could assure the House that it is his understanding that the current wording in fact includes the items to which the Hon. Member for Churchill referred, namely, the discussion and negotiations on the M and M supplementary pension, the welfare plan, and the supplementary unemployment benefit program. Would he assure us that it is the Government's intention to include these items?

Mr. Cadieux: Mr. Chairman, I believe I have already indicated that. We have been informed by the drafters of the Bill that they were included. That is why subclause 2(1)(b) is there.

Clause agreed to.

On Clause 3—*Resumption of Operations and Work*

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of amendments to Clause 3. However I should first like to move the following:

That subclause 3(a) of Bill C-24 be amended by deleting line 18 on page 2 and substituting the following:

"all grain handling operations at ports".

The Chairman: The Chair has read the proposed amendment of the Hon. Member for Churchill and finds it to be in order.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Chairman, could the Hon. Member explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. Angus: Mr. Chairman, the amendment in the name of the Hon. Member for Churchill along with another three amendments to be dealt with later are designed to meet the intent of the legislation. As we understand it, the intent of the legislation is to ensure that Canadian grain will begin to move again on the West Coast.

Rather than tinker with the collective bargaining process, which one would assume is still under way in British Columbia, our purpose is to instruct the companies, through this amendment, to open their gates so that workers can return to work at those places which deal with grain. Thereby we would relieve the pressure upon the federal Government and upon western Canadian farmers by allowing their products to go to market. At the same time we would not be interfering

Maintenance of Ports Operations Act, 1986

further in the collective bargaining process. The union and company association involved would continue to take whatever actions they deem appropriate to achieve a collective agreement dealing with all other bulk commodities and, in particular, with the question of the movement of containers. That is the intent of this particular amendment as well as the additional three amendments to the same clause.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, I need a few more details about what is being proposed by the Hon. Member. He referred to grains. Is it his view that other agricultural products should be included in the same way? If that is the case, why are they not covered by the amendment of the Hon. Member for Churchill?

Having conferred with the Hon. Member for Algoma, who is our Party's critic and an expert on such matters, far more than most Members of the House, I am not even sure whether oil seeds and other agricultural products have been included. Perhaps the Hon. Member could indicate whether he feels oil seeds would be covered by the description of grains in his amendment. Perhaps he could elaborate upon whether or not he feels other agricultural products should be covered.

The reason I am asking these questions is that while it is recognized that "grains" is a generic term, we often refer to grains and oil seeds. I want to be assured that both are covered under his proposal this morning.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member used the term "grains" as being generic. In drafting this particular amendment and those to follow, it was the intention that it would be interpreted as the generic. If a grain product is being prevented from moving because of a decision by the British Columbia Maritime Employers Association, we think that it should be allowed to be moved. Quite frankly, those particular gates should be unlocked for the purpose of supporting prairie producers of any kind of grain commodity. Supposedly the whole purpose of the legislation is to provide for the movement of grains and agricultural products.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, I am not being critical; I am just seeking further explanation of the meaning of the Hon. Member's amendment.

Would he entertain a further amendment, or is he thinking of amending it further, to cover other agricultural commodities shipped out of the same port?

Although we are speaking largely in terms of grains and oil seeds exported from that port, nevertheless it deals with other agricultural commodities, perishables, and some livestock, although certainly not in as great quantities as the other products. We recognize the general difficulty faced by agriculture, not just the grain sector. Although we know that its case is a particularly difficult one, generally we recognize that agriculture is faced with difficulties. Would the Hon. Member entertain amending it to cover other agricultural products? Perhaps it is just an oversight. I think it would further his very good proposal this morning.