

and at whether they fit certain criteria to come before the House of Commons as a votable matter.

In this particular case this matter has been chosen not to be a votable matter and to go no further than the debate in the House today. That was as a result of them looking and deciding, for whatever reason, that this particular bill lacked what it took to become a votable matter for further discussion. I point that out simply to make sure that everybody who is watching understands full well what the procedures are here.

If I can turn directly to the bill before the House, I think it is important to look at the crux of the proposed amendment. I would like to read it into the record. It refers to section 89 and I suggest is the crux of the matter. It reads:

Notwithstanding subsections (1) and (2), no trade union of employees engaged in the handling, storage, transportation or shipping of grain shall declare or authorize a strike and no employer of such employees shall declare or cause a lockout.

That is what we have before us, something that is saying notwithstanding what the law says we are going to single out one sector or our economy and say no fellas, or women, you can no longer use the right to withdraw your services.

As has been pointed out by my friend in the Liberal Party, that is a right that has long been fought for throughout the history of labour. It is the only thing that an employee has to use in order to better his lot.

We do not want to go back to the sweatshop days. We have progressed far beyond that. I do not want to lose sight of how important it is for the movement of grain to continue as uninterrupted as possible to the ports. It is important not just for the farmers, but it is important to the economy of the prairies and it is important to the economy of Canada as a whole. I caution that the way of doing this is not by setting, as unfortunately this member did toward the end of his speech, the trade union or labour movement against the farmers and the farmers against the grain handlers. The provisions are there for an adequate collective bargaining system.

I have been involved throughout my lifetime in strikes when I worked in the trade union movement. I have been involved as an employer in strikes and lockouts as a member of town councils. I have been an employer as a

lawyer. I have also worked for the B.C. department of labour in labour standards. I understand the movement and I understand what is going on. I have worked through all of them. I have been involved in a number of strikes and lockouts in both the mining industry and in the pulp and paper industry, as well as lockouts and strikes on the municipal level. I have been involved in the bargaining process on both sides of the fence, on both the labour and management sides.

The collective agreement process works if given the opportunity. We only have to look in the grain industry to this summer in particular when the type of job action anticipated in this bill was avoided by the parties, when an agreement was reached between the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the grain workers' union. Again it shows that the collective agreement process does work.

I wonder if this is the thin edge of the wedge. We legislate now the grain workers—and I agree that the movement of grain is important to the economy of this country—but do we now expand what we are doing here? Do we expand it into those areas in small communities where the community is being devastated because of a lockout or strike situation? Do we expand it every time that there is a nurses' strike, a teachers' strike, or a lockout because it is essential that these people get back to work for the very economy of the communities?

Do we continue in this vein? Do we stick the wedge in, try to split it wide open and gut the collective agreement process in Canada? I suggest no. There are other alternatives.

The conciliation process as set out here in part can and should be given the opportunity to work. People should be given that opportunity to reach an agreement. They should be able to use the right that they have earned in order to withdraw their services if that is the case or, in the case of a lockout situation, I suggest that management can do the same thing.

I do not think we accomplish anything with this particular motion before us but cause heartache and problems. Every time we get into difficulties and if it hurts us personally, the temptation is always there to short circuit the system; let us find a way around the inconvenience. It is natural.