

ment of grain. We realize that when there is a tie-up involving the export of grain and other commodities people begin to talk about a national disaster leading to a confrontation. I suggest that the government should accept its responsibility in this regard instead of passing it on to someone else. If the government did this there would be no reason for passing legislation to handle this type of situation.

In recognizing the extreme importance of our export markets we should consider the position of the middleman in the movement of grain. We should decide whether this man is interested in making profits from moving grain and other commodities out of the country. We might also consider the idea of nationalizing our ports and adopting a comprehensive transportation policy.

All this could be looked into by a committee vested with authority to look into the general picture and problems affecting the whole movement of cargoes through ports in Canada. It has been noted in the past that people in the port of Vancouver would rather unload U.S. goods than Canadian goods. It has been suggested that grain could be handled separately. I am sure all members of the House would agree to a study to determine the effectiveness of moving grain as an item separate from general cargo.

With those remarks I should like to move:

That Clause 8, Part II be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"provided however that before December 31, 1972, the government shall initiate a study under the Inquiries Act into the possibility of separating grain from general cargo, such grain to be handled by the Canadian Wheat Board."

There may be some question whether grain should be handled by the Canadian Wheat Board or the National Harbours Board. We support the contention that the Canadian Wheat Board should be made responsible for such handling. If it is to be responsible for moving our grain into export position and making sales, it should be given the authority to move grain through the Port of Vancouver and other Canadian ports. We recognize the importance of this situation, and this amendment would require that some consideration be given to the setting up of a study to determine a better method of moving grain out of the country.

The Deputy Chairman: At first consideration the amendment appears to be unacceptable in that it moves quite far beyond that which the committee is considering at this time. To my mind it embodies a completely new proposal. On the other hand, when looking at the clock I wonder if the best and quickest solution might be to have the committee decided rather than to start a procedural debate. My first thought is that the amendment is not acceptable.

Mr. Baldwin: In view of the fact we have not got copies of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you would read it.

The Deputy Chairman: Without putting the amendment at this time I will read it. It is moved by Mr. Skoberg that Clause 8, Part II, be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and by adding immediately thereafter the following words: "provided however that

West Coast Ports Operations Bill

before December 31, 1972, the government shall initiate a study under the Inquiries Act into the possibility of separating grain from general cargo, such grain to be handled by the Canadian Wheat Board."

I will accept the amendment as being put in order that we can have a general discussion without questioning the procedural aspect.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Chairman, I failed to understand your words of advice to the committee and I would seek your guidance. I have some doubts about the wisdom of the amendment and whether it will be good or bad for Canadian commerce. If I am in order I will proceed with my reasons. I understand that you were somewhat dubious whether it was in order but you were prepared to accept it in view of the time.

• (2150)

The Deputy Chairman: The first impression of the Chair is that the amendment is not an amendment but a substantive motion, but because of the time, if the committee is ready to consider the motion as it is, the Chair will accept it. I have read it to the committee. If the hon. member wishes to speak on the amendment, the Chair is ready to listen.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Chairman, the amendment, according to my limited knowledge of the rules of the House, is out of order. It does not apply to clause 8 and it does not particularly apply to clause 7. I am not in a position to debate the question as to whether it is in order or out of order, but I preface my remarks by saying that personally I believe it is out of order. The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) has failed to distribute a copy of his amendment. I would now like to thank the hon. member for personally delivering the amendment to me.

The amendment says that the government shall initiate a study under the Inquiries Act into the possibility of separating grain from general cargo, such grain to be handled by the Canadian Wheat Board. My remarks regarding the amendment were to the point. It seems to me that this is the wrong place at which to move such an amendment. The amendment should be debated at the longshoremen's union level at a particular point.

I am under the impression that there are 3,200 longshoremen at the west coast ports and something like 65 or 70 are involved in the handling and movement of grain. I am diametrically opposed to a complex situation which would involve the important matter of grain movement, which encompasses one fortieth of the total number of workers. It seems to me that this is quite wrong. I have been one who has long argued and fought against the amalgamation of various workers involved in union strikes. I believe that steel workers should be steel workers and grain handlers should be grain handlers, and that each should have the right to unionize.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Horner: This over-all amalgamation of unions gives the total union a great deal of political strength, far more strength in the market place than it should have. I have been long opposed to that practice, and I say to you, Mr.