

*Labour Dispute*

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to certain press reports which would indicate that legislation ordering a resumption of longshoring would not be obeyed. I can understand the disappointment of both the employees and the employers being the subject of parliamentary intervention. It is obvious that one party or the other, or both parties, will not be satisfied with the provisions of the legislation. But this is an inevitable consequence of the failure of the parties to find their own solution. While I can sympathize with the sentiments which lie behind the news reports from the St. Lawrence River ports, I know that common sense will prevail and the longshoremen will go back to work under terms which compare favourably with any in the longshoring industry in this country.

I wish to thank hon. members for giving me the attention they have. I hope that although they have not had time to consider the legislation in detail, through the course of the afternoon they will be able to study it and, I hope, support the proposed action of the government.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister for an explanation since this matter came up very quickly. Am I right in my understanding that under the previous agreement, longshoremen were guaranteed a base minimum of 40 hours for some 37 weeks, which works out to 1,480 hours, and that under Mr. Justice Gold's proposal longshoremen at the port of Quebec will be reduced to 1,400 hours, and at Trois-Rivières to 1,200 hours? In the hasty arithmetic I have done, that would indicate that unless there is a great deal of overtime the guaranteed pay that they will receive at Trois-Rivières and the port of Quebec, even with an increase in wages, could be less than they are getting at present. I wonder if the minister has looked at this matter and is prepared to take it into consideration. The minister has said that this legislation will relieve the employers, but I do not think that is its primary purpose.

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** I would like to check the point that the hon. member has raised, quite rightly, with respect to the ports of Quebec and Trois-Rivières. I would point out, of course, that the guarantee has been increased for the port of Montreal from 1,480 hours to 1,600 hours. I am trying to check whether there was a differential from the previous collective agreement.

**Mr. Orlikow:** I have a question for the minister, Mr. Speaker. The minister used the illustration of a longshoreman who worked 32 hours in one week and was paid for that, then the next week he worked 48 hours: the eight hours of what was formerly overtime would be charged against the hours of the week before when he did not work 40 hours. At what rate of pay would he be paid for the extra eight hours? Would he be paid at the regular rate of pay, or would it be at overtime rates?

● (1540)

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** He would be paid at overtime rates. The portion which was normal overtime would be credited to the previous week, but he would be paid at overtime rates.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I would like to make one thing clear. The minister indicated that he would give

[Mr. Munro (Hamilton East).]

further information in reply to the question of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). This will not be possible after I have recognized another speaker because the minister, when he replies, will close the debate. Therefore, I hope hon. members will be satisfied if the reply is given at that time. Otherwise, it will have to be done in committee or in the committee of the whole House, as the House wishes.

**Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to lead off the debate on second reading on behalf of my party, I want to say first that my party will support in principle the legislation which the minister has brought before the House. We will support this legislation because, as all hon. members know, my colleague the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle), along with my colleague from the Cr ditiste party, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), introduced motions a week ago today calling for a special debate, with specific reference to the very serious situation which was plaguing farm producers of the province of Quebec because of their inability to obtain, on a stable basis, sufficient supplies of grain to feed their livestock.

In addition, my party supports this bill for some of the reasons the minister put forward in his brief remarks a few minutes ago. As I said a week ago, I believe all hon. members of this House agree that illegal action on the part of some people involved in an otherwise legal strike cannot be tolerated in this country. However, having said that, we will support this bill. Having made quite clear that this support is a result of our belief that the situation has reached a point of some urgency and that action has to be taken, we say to the minister and to the government that we are not completely happy with the formula the minister is using and which is incorporated in this bill. We are not completely happy with it because, once again, hon. members of this House, no matter to which party they may belong, are being asked to determine among themselves an appropriate award in a very complicated dispute between the Maritime Employers Association and three locals of the longshoremen's union.

I am charged by my caucus with responsibility for the question of labour. We have said before that it is not the function of parliament to try to determine what is a fair settlement between the parties to a dispute. I cannot emphasize this too much. I have here the Gold report which is the basis of the legislation. Admittedly, it is not a perfect copy but I count about 60 pages before I even get to the appendices which Chief Justice Gold attached to it. This report came into my hands within the last few days. I am sure that most hon. members have not yet had the opportunity of seeing it, and they are not likely to have a chance to see it before we have gone through all stages of this bill which imposes upon the parties the recommendations of Chief Justice Gold.

I say to the minister most sincerely that I agree with him when he says it is probably impossible to obtain the services of anyone better than Chief Justice Gold. But that is not the whole question. The question is whether we have a satisfactory approach to this kind of problem. I know the minister's feelings about the importance of the right to strike in a free community. I think he knows my feelings on that, too, and I think we agree that in a