

First of all, I think it is fair for me to say that we find the Government's method of intervention both weak on the one hand and dangerous on the other. I want to explain both of those words because I think they are worth listening to. First of all, this legislation will do absolutely nothing to deal with the fundamental problems which have been festering on the west coast now for 13 years. The Minister himself felt it necessary to articulate all the problems because after 13 years the Government has not been able to solve any of them. The Minister went through the whole Commission report, but it is worth pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that the specific issues which have to be faced are not going to be solved by this legislation. The Government has not created an environment by which those very specific matters can be dealt with.

We had the problems in 1969-70. We had them later on in the mid-1970s, 1975, problems such as premium shift differentials, training of casual workers, destuffing container clauses. Those things are fundamental to a long-term solution not only to the west coast situation, but indeed the whole western Canadian economy. And the Government, be it noted, after 13 years is still simply articulating the problems. That is why it is weak. This intervention will not solve any of those long-standing problems.

What is also dangerous, Mr. Speaker, is the specific way in which the Government chooses to intervene. This is not the first time in the history of this country that the federal Government has had to intervene to bring about industrial peace because a dispute affected the general economy of the country. Because the Bill was just brought in last night, I had only a short time to look at some of the debates in the past 30 years, in 1950 and in 1960, throughout the whole period since World War II, where the Government has on a number of occasions had to intervene to bring about industrial peace. If you look at those debates, they involve expressions of opinion from the then CCF Party, the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party, some Members of which represented a variety of interests and walks of life. They agreed on two things when it came to federal Government intervention. First of all, I was proud to read from all sides of the House in those old debates that people were interested, while they were intervening, in protecting the rights of all people involved in the dispute. There was a lot of articulation about the rights of people. I have not heard anything about the rights of people so far today from the Government.

Secondly, there was direct Government intervention to get the work going again, but then they appointed arbitrators. They adopted the principle of arbitration. There were two reasons for that, Mr. Speaker. First of all, it allows an opportunity for some of the specific problems to be dealt with. Secondly, it disallows the politicization of the process. This Government is now going to intervene directly in terms of a solution, in terms of all of those matters, and is going to politicize the process.

The mechanism the Government is going to use, Mr. Speaker, is the Public Sector Compensation Restraint Act. That Act was not meant for this purpose. That Act was meant

### *West Coast Ports Operations Act*

for the Public Service. It was meant to be used for the purpose of financial restraint. It was not to be an instrument by which the Government now directly controls the traditional rights of the private sector, both workers and management.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Crombie:** That is why it is dangerous. Make no mistake about that danger.

I think I have to make a plea to the Minister because I am going to be moving an amendment and I want him to consider that amendment in a moment. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, in the heat of the needs of the time, when we have to do something unusual, whether in time of war or apprehended insurrections or in times of economic and social stress when the Government has to act, in the rush to act great harm can be done and people's rights and freedoms can be trampled on. Losing rights is easy to do. Gaining rights and keeping rights is very, very difficult.

The reason that using this Act is dangerous is that we have nothing less than the unilateral imposition of the Government's will on individuals and groups. If the Government, Mr. Speaker, can impose unilaterally and by direct action its will on individuals and groups such as the workers in this industry, why not workers in any industry? Indeed, if it can do it in this industry and to workers in any industry, why just workers? What holds the Government back? What holds this Parliament back from unilaterally imposing its will on individuals and groups?

That is why, Mr. Speaker, the tradition we have respected in this country has been the tradition of arbitration. It allows third party intervention and allows for some opportunity to deal with the root problems. More importantly, it does not politicize the process. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be proposing a series of amendments in committee, and I am going to be proposing that we adopt those amendments so that we can begin the arbitration process.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, our position is this: we must support the Bill in order to get commerce moving on the west coast today. Secondly, we want the process of arbitration to begin so that the final solution and settlement between the parties will be determined by the traditions of this country and not by the unilateral imposition by this Government of its will on rights and freedoms which the traditions of this country have always upheld.

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate this afternoon. I would like to first of all comment on the Minister's remarks with regard to what has taken place and the necessity for this legislation. I want to reaffirm to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Caccia) that we pinpointed this very, very serious flaw that the Government was following with the introduction of Bill C-124, and the process of the Canada Labour Code and his involvement. We tried to have him appear before the committee to discuss those very serious problems, but we were unable to do so.