

It was suggested in committee that the groupings were very vague. Presently an individual is a voting member of the group but is in effect representing all of the trade unions involved in the movement and handling of grain. I believe that if the Minister could select an individual, mechanisms could be found to ensure that both eastern and western ports have representation as well. I believe that the existing representative could be from either the east or the west. They have no distinct loyalties to any one of the ports and have some participation in them. The same thing applies to the railroads.

I urge the Minister to give consideration to, at the very least, providing observer status for the ports in order that they can lobby on behalf of their citizens to ensure that their ports are used to the best possible advantage.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I follow the argument of the Hon. Member. However, I am having some difficulty with the wording of the proposed amendment. I have great difficulty trying to determine how this particular amendment would fit in with Clause 5, because that clause says "Paragraph 10(3)(b) of the said Act is repealed". The motion says:

That Bill C-44, be amended in Clause 5 by striking out line 38 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"repealed, and the following paragraphs are added:

(B) a person who in his opinion represents the port cities of the eastern division; and

(C) a person who in his opinion represents the port cities of the western division".

I suspect that part of the problem is that we do not have a printed version of the Bill as it was amended in committee. That may have some bearing on it. I wonder if that could be explained.

While I appreciate the purport of the Hon. Member's motion, to suggest that one should appoint a person representing the port cities of the eastern division and western division is fairly broad. In reality it is poorly drafted and I am not sure whether it would be found acceptable by the legal draftsmen.

For example, in British Columbia, which could be referred to as the western division, there is a port in Vancouver, North Vancouver, New Westminster, Roberts Bank, and Prince Rupert. There would be a lot of discretion left to the Minister. Quite frankly, I think the Hon. Member may want to reflect and probably withdraw.

I believe that what the Hon. Member has said has merit. I believe he is really thinking about getting some assurance that the port of Thunder Bay will have some representation on the Senior Grain Transportation Committee, either as a representative or as an observer. I think he would also expect, as a balance, to have someone representing the western ports, either Prince Rupert or Vancouver. Quite frankly, I think his suggestion has merit. Notwithstanding the disposition of this particular motion, I would certainly undertake to explore ways and means to bring forward representatives, perhaps in the form of observers for starters. We will be going through a complete review of Bill C-44. We may be able to accommodate the thrust of his motion in that respect.

Western Grain Transportation Act

If he would be willing to accept it on that basis, perhaps he might agree to withdraw the motion. I repeat that the review of Bill C-44 will take place, commencing the crop year 1985-86, at which time there will obviously be further amendments as the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) suggested yesterday. I will certainly take into consideration very seriously the valid arguments that he has made tonight.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his comments. Assuming that we have unanimous consent to withdraw the motion, I would be very happy to do so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): I presume that the Hon. Member is rising on a point of order. I cannot let him take the floor under any other circumstances.

Mr. Angus: I am rising on a point of order to indicate to the Minister that I would be more than happy to withdraw my motion because very clearly he has indicated his willingness to ensure there is representation in the organization. I look forward to working with him to ensure that that happens.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. The Minister raises a valid point. It may be that the amendment moved yesterday was on the wrong line and on the wrong clause. That happens to all of us. I only want to add what my colleague for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. Angus) said. I will confess right now that we made a slight error and should have said "grain handling ports" which would have eliminated a number of ports on the West Coast in particular that do not handle one bushel.

I simply want to make it clear to the Minister that we want someone there, whether it is an observer or a voting Member, to represent Prince Rupert and Vancouver in the grain handling operations and Thunder Bay and Churchill in the grain handling operations which is the western and eastern directions in the context of the language used by the Canadian Grain Commission, the Canadian Wheat Board and others.

When we talk about Eastern Division, that goes as far as Thunder Bay and slightly east. That is the point we want to make to the Minister. We are concerned about the Western Grain Transportation grain operations from Thunder Bay west. It would be one person for Thunder Bay and Churchill and one person for the West Coast grain handling ports. Whether they are observers or become voting members later on, we welcome the Minister's undertaking and my colleague is prepared to withdraw the amendment, as he indicated.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Is there unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Angus) withdraw.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Minister of Transport) moved that Bill C-44, an Act to amend the Western Grain Transportation Act, as amended, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.