company. It refers to the employers' association, but I am not sure if it means the individual members of the employers' association. I ask the Minister to look at that question. As he knows, there is a list in the schedule of 30 or 40 employers who are members of that association. Can one of them, on their own, abrogate or disobey the provisions of this Act? Are they covered as an individual employer or an officer or representative of the individual company? Are they covered, or is it only the officer or representative of the entire employers' association?

• (1620)

Under Clause 13(2) there is provision that

> No officer or representative of a union who is convicted of an offence under this Act that was committed while the officer or representative was acting in that capacity shall be employed in any capacity by, or act as an officer or representative of, the union at any time during the five years immediately after the date of the conviction.

What about the company officers? Will the Minister move an amendment that no officer or representative acting on behalf of the Maritime Employers' Association, or any member company thereof, who is convicted may serve in that capacity as an officer, member of the board of directors or representative of that company for the five years after this Act comes into force?

When Parliament has to intervene, however reluctantly, in this kind of situation, it must not only be seen to be but must actually be even-handed. What is sauce for that particular goose is also sauce for that gander. It would only take the Minister a few minutes to add a paragraph to that clause which covers officers, representatives, directors, et cetera, of all the companies which are members of the British Columbia Maritime Employers' Association as well as the association itself.

There is a lesson the Government should learn from this experience. The previous Government did not learn it, or if it did it did nothing about it. There is a requirement for a total look at the operation of our ports on the West Coast. I know the Minister will want his commission of inquiry to study other aspects of the Port of Vancouver and other ports on the West Coast. It should study their competitiveness, how well they are equipped, et cetera. The International Longshoremen's Union has done a thorough analysis, particularly of the Port of Vancouver and other Fraser River ports, of their competitiveness, capacity and ability to compete and attract business. They have studied Tacoma and Seattle as well.

There is a lot of what I would call "chamber of commerce hype" being peddled about saying that if we got rid of the container clause Vancouver could handle 80,000 more containers a year. To put it politely, that is hogwash. In 1986, the Port of Vancouver handled 66,000 inbound containers and 83,000 outbound containers. All year long ships have to wait for a crane in order to load or unload containers. We require at least three more cranes at two of the terminals in order to handle the containers we are now getting. If we were to achieve this nirvana of a no-container clause and 80,000 more containers were to arrive at Vancouver during the next year, I do not know how they would be handled, unless the maritime employers are going to carry them on their backs. There is no way. They need acres and acres more for storage space container traffic, general merchandise and bulk commodities; potash and sulfur in particular. We need at least three large capacity cranes now and three more over the next two or three years. We need that with or without a container clause in the collective agreement.

To lay the blame for the difficulties of the Port of Vancouver on the container clause and the longshoremen is not only misleading, but misrepresenting the requirements of and the situation in Vancouver. There is a perfectly good reason why Seattle and Tacoma are doing so well. It is not just a container clause. It is their new and modern facilities. We are wringing our hands about being competitive and saying that it is all the fault of the container clause. That is really stretching it, Mr. Speaker.

We will not be able to handle any increased traffic in the Port of Vancouver without a massive investment in enlarged and modernized facilities, automated equipment, etc. The union recognizes that because it means job security for them and more jobs eventually as well as the welfare and good order of their employees, the Port of Vancouver, the whole Province of British Columbia and the entire country.

I have research here to which we must pay attention. I believe it will be circulated to all Members. I hope the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) and others will proceed to kick the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. de Cotret) around and get some activity on the things which need to be done in order to keep the West Coast ports competitive and able to attract and properly and efficiently handle increased traffic. Although containers are being held up as causing all the problems, that is not the case.

In fact, of 176,000 containers handled in 1985, 16.5 per cent of those inbound were subject to unpacking. Two point seven per cent of the outbound containers were subject to packing. In 1986, 12.6 per cent of 66,000 containers were subject to mandatory unpacking under the collective agreement. Of 83,000 outbound containers, 2.1 per cent were subject to mandatory packing. It is not true that the container clause is the major impediment to increased capacity and handling for container traffic. The best one can say for anyone who claims that is that they are badly misinformed. Let us not get ourselves distracted from the real issues, about how we make our West Coast ports better.

• (1630)

In conclusion, we want time to think about this tonight. We may or may not have some amendments, and I say to the Minister honestly that we hope he will have some forethought and accept some amendments which we may be contemplating. I assure him that we will notify him and the Official Opposition of any amendments we may have so that we may consult, reach an agreement on what is acceptable and deal with the