

Western Grain Transportation Act

with it through to 1990. This is quite important because it ties in with a master port plan for the Port of Vancouver.

Under Bill C-155 and the proposed funding that would go along with that, no moneys were allocated to deal with rail improvements to relieve the congestion that now exists and will increase in the future. The report attempts to evaluate potential alternative solutions to such shortfalls. I will deal with those in a moment. It also develops recommendations and some very interesting alternative ways which would, through an integrated planning process and integrated use of all the rail systems under an authority, ensure the availability of needed rail capacity for the foreseeable future. It would make much better use of the available resources of all the railway systems in an integrated way so that we could deal with the bottlenecks that are there now and the greatly increased bottlenecks that are anticipated for the future as our economy hopefully recovers and there is more shipping through the port.

The scope of the study covers demand for railway movement through Vancouver until 1990. This amendment which deals with rail car traffic improvements should be considered in terms of future as well as present projected traffic volumes. The report forecasts that the demand for rail car movement through Vancouver, which is based on a recently released Port of Vancouver master plan, will increase considerably. It also assumes that forecasts from the CN and CP Rail systems indicate that they will expand their main line rail capacity through the mountains and increase capacity which, in turn, will create problems as they flow into the Vancouver region—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. I regret having to stop the Hon. Member but her time has expired. She could continue with the unanimous consent of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): There is not unanimous consent.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I would like it to be made known that I did not deny consent to the Hon. Member who is from that part of Canada in which I reside.

I would like to offer a few comments in reply to the comments made by the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) about the fact that the Government will be voting against this amendment because the CTC—

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): I never said that.

Mr. Huntington: He says that he never said that. He spoke against the amendment. I think I have it right now. He spoke against it because he said it was redundant, that the CTC was already in place and you could not have another authority with the powers that would require the Administrator to find the shortest and best route for the benefit of producers.

● (1640)

I want to deal with that point. The CTC has had these powers and, historically, has not represented the best interests of the producers. I do not want to be unfair, but the problem has existed from time immemorial. I have been told by labour union leaders in the Port of Vancouver that if we were to address the switching limit problems in that port and re-arrange the dispatching of grain cars into the Port of Vancouver, those two areas alone could improve the delivery of grain to the port by some 200 cars per day.

We are pretty good at taking the side of management and established interests, but it is pretty frustrating for the rank and file grain worker and port worker to realize that certain efficiencies are available to management but are not taken up, as is the case with the switching limit and the method of dispatching grain cars to Vancouver to match the grade of grain required by the orders that fill the ships. The over-all integration of the management of the system, from the hinterland down to the port, has some faults which are the direct responsibility of management and are nothing to do with the grain farmer who struggles for a living wage.

If the Government were to accept the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) it would require the Administrator to do what is right for the producer. You would then have a force in place that would allow some correction of the inefficiencies within the system.

What we are doing in Bill C-155 and what we are doing by ignoring this type of amendment, is delivering the whole bundle over to one element of a transportation system. We are not placing normal marketplace forces against that element to compel it to be competitive and efficient. In that way we work against the direct interests of the producer, and that means that we work against the Port of Vancouver and all the other elements in western Canada.

I notice that in the United States the subsidy is \$1.12 per bushel, while in Canada it is 37 cents per bushel. However, none of the subsidy in the United States is delivered specifically to transportation. In that country, they are far too smart to do that. They deliver it to the producer and give him the freedom of choice to use those elements of the transportation system that help him operate in the most cost-effective mode. That is what this clause is trying to impose in this bad piece of legislation.

Just the other day I had a conversation with a very senior person in the transportation system about the Port of Vancouver. He said that what we fail to realize is that Bill C-155 is not a grain Bill; that it is a transportation Bill for coal, sulphur, potash and other commodities.

The container movement in the Port of Vancouver relies on grain for 40 per cent to 50 per cent of the outbound trade of containers. That information was given to us by the Vancouver delegation that came to Ottawa some two weeks ago. We rely on that outbound trade of full containers of grain products from the hinterland, the Canadian prairie basin, to attract container ships into the port and provide the some 400 jobs involved at