

should at least have the same prohibitions, the same interdictions applying to employers. How can we tell employees that, if they break the law, they could be kicked out of the union for five years when there is no equivalent sanction for employers? We are going to move to have this provision withdrawn, because I know there have been instances, involving even Liberal Governments, where the Government and the Opposition supported back-to-work legislation, whether the problem was a strike or a lockout. There are precedents.

There have been quite a few instances but, to my knowledge, this is the first time, as far as we have been able to ascertain, that we have a penalty to the extent of putting someone out of his job for five years. For instance, if we look at the Shipping Continuation Act which was passed in 1978, at the time the penalty for refusing to submit to the legislation and breaking the law was contempt of court order. That was the penalty in 1978. Contempt of court. If . . .

● (1130)

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would ask the Hon. Member to conclude as her time has expired.

[Translation]

Ms. Copps: It meant a \$100 fine. So I think there are precedents for imposing less serious penalties and for at least having the penalty apply to both employees and employers.

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain).

Mr. St. Germain: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) questioned numerous aspects of the Bill. I would like to address a couple of the matters she brought up this morning. She obviously has only one issue in question, that is, Clause 13. She mentioned this point twice in English and once in French. She repeated herself three times on this very clause. She pointed out that she did not have time to study the Bill, which was obvious by the fact that she kept repeating herself on this particular issue. It is an important issue. I agree with the Hon. Member in that respect. However, I do not think that we need her making the country believe that she is the sole protector of labour in the House of Commons. As a union president in the past I will certainly stand up for labour front and centre, which was proven in this House when the issue of shakes and shingles was before us. At that time her own Party refused to protect the jobs in the shake and shingle industry by refusing to reject the exportation of logs, blocks, bolts and blanks to the United States of America. So we do not need any lessons on the issue from the Hon. Member. The NDP stood with us on this issue when it was raised. The Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) took a strong position with us, but Members of the Liberal Party did not. The Liberal Party was prepared to sell out to the shake and shingle industry.

Maintenance of Ports Operations Act, 1986

Let us now come down to the ILWU union aspect. Had the Hon. Member been in the House yesterday to listen to the debate on this particular issue she would have heard the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) bring an amendment forward to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Cadieux). The Minister of Labour said it was an excellent idea. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment will be implemented into the legislation.

The Hon. Member has also misled, not intentionally, the House in that she said these people will be deprived of being able to earn a livelihood. That is totally wrong. If she were to read the clause she would see that they will only be deprived of sitting as executives of the union, but they will still be able to be longshoremen. If she were to read the proposed amendment—

Ms. Copps: You don't even know what a bargaining agent is. Have you not ever heard of a full-time union appointee?

Mr. St. Germain: The fact is that the amendment which has been presented so adeptly by the New Democratic Party and which we are prepared to accept as a Party is well taken.

The Hon. Member spoke of cranes. If the Hon. Member knew anything about the West Coast she would know that there are 31 cranes in Seattle and Tacoma simply because the business has been going there. That is what we have to stop. If the Hon. Member knew anything about the West Coast she would know that the Americans are thinking of building a port in Bellingham, which is just south of the border. That is why we have to get the business back to British Columbia. For years the matter has not been resolved.

I would like the Hon. Member to comment on what she really knows about the West Coast in terms of shipping and cranes. It is a disgrace to get up in the House and not know anything about an issue on which one speaks. This is nearly a repeat of the shakes and shingles issue. And Members of the Liberal Party are all excited again because they do not know the issues on the West Coast and they are trying to deal with a problem about which they know nothing. I would like the Hon. Member to comment on the cranes and why she was not here yesterday to hear the Hon. Member for Regina West when he so adeptly brought forward his recommendation.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, for one who describes himself as a former union president, I am disturbed that he does not seem to understand how unions operate. Of course I repeated the issue with respect to Clause 13. I repeated it and I will continue to repeat it because it is a union-busting clause. This is anti-union legislation and Members of the Conservative Party got caught with their pants down. The Hon. Member should not talk to us in the Liberal Party about fighting for the working man and woman. I represent the most industrialized riding in the country and I have the right to speak out on labour matters.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!