

*Maintenance of Ports Operations Act, 1986*

port if the container clause is taken out. At the same time, the unions are very concerned that there will be a loss of jobs. The Hon. Member has to some extent already made this point, but I would be interested in hearing confirmation from him that the terms of reference and that Clause 7 should make provision for the matter of development of the port, and so on. Without the development of the port and the competitive position, those jobs may well not be there.

• (1230)

The Hon. Member has very well outlined the type of aggressive marketing made by the ports of Seattle and Tacoma. But there was legislation in the Western Grain Transportation Act which required that CN and CP improve rail facilities and port facilities in Vancouver and other West Coast ports. Yet the Government is not pressing to see those actions taken to improve the port and make it more competitive. I would be interested to know if the Hon. Member feels that these types of provisions should be included in Clause 7 of the Bill. These provisions require that the industrial disputes commissioner report—perhaps not in a binding way—on the container clause, because that is in the Act, and as well that he report on job security, development of the port, development of rail facilities, and the improvement of the competitive position of the port. Unless that happens, there will not be the extra jobs which the employers' association is forecasting. Naturally, the employees will be unhappy if that competitive position does not improve with the removal of the container clause and the jobs are not there.

**Mr. Fulton:** I will be very brief in response to that question. The industrial inquiry commission will find that it has to look at some of the points that the Hon. Member has touched on. There is no doubt that in terms of the questions on rail, warehousing space, crane capacity, docking facilities, it is a great deal to ask of the commission to get a clear grip within six months. Because of the broad powers provided under the Inquiries Act, to be able to cross-examine witnesses and subpoena documents, a considerable amount of information at the nub of the issue will be looked at.

In terms of the broader aspects of the port, in terms of grain handling capacity, to ask the industrial inquiries commission to do all of that within six months would be unrealistic. Then you start getting into the questions of hopper cars, demurrage, how much grain is going to be moving out, what are the likely long-term contractual prospects with the Soviet Union, China, and everyone else.

In terms of what is presently in the Bill, I do not think it is possible to amend that clause to provide for something much broader. Certainly, as a British Columbia Member, I would like a process put in place that takes a closer look at all of the ports on the West Coast, and looks at the best way of developing those for dealing with the Pacific Rim, and market commodities that are just now starting to come on line. Here I think of new coal prospects, new grain markets, new wood

products, and other new products that may come on line, as well as new imports coming into the country.

In terms of asking the industrial inquiry commission to deal with everything that has been dealt with in the Larson Report, it is quite clear that the Government has decided to go another way. In terms of amending this Bill to try and throw all of the Larson recommendations in under Clause 7, I frankly think that would be ruled out of order during this debate.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question is as follows: The Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux, Minister of Labour, moved:

That Bill C-24, an Act to provide for the maintenance of ports operations, be read the second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to Committee of the Whole.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** On division.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Danis in the Chair.

**The Chairman:** House in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-24, an Act to provide for the maintenance of port operations.

Shall Clause 2 carry?

On Clause 2—*Definitions*

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Chairman, I move:

That Bill C-24 be amended on page 1 by deleting line 21 and substituting the following:

—payments in respect of pensions, M & M, Supplementary Pension, Welfare Plan and Supplementary Unemployment Benefit Program.

**Mr. Cadieux:** Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that the amendment proposed by my hon. colleague is unnecessary in view of the fact that those items mentioned in the amendment are already included in subparagraph (b). That is the reason why subparagraph (b) is there. I do not see the necessity of such an amendment.

**The Chairman:** The Chair is ready to rule on the amendment. The Hon. Member for Churchill.

**Mr. Murphy:** There are two different things. Obviously, the Chair does have the right to rule. However, in response to what the Minister has said, I do believe it is very important that we have some real guarantee that the words I have mentioned are included with what is in subparagraph (b). I would certainly prefer to see the Minister stand up in this House and indicate that he is willing to accept this wording just to make sure that the worker's right to these extra benefits are guaranteed.

**The Chairman:** I am ready to make my ruling. It may not be necessary to hear the Minister. I have the proposed amendment by the Member for Churchill which appears to me to be