

*Canada Grain Act*

What a shock this is; what a terrible thing we have here. Surely the minister himself, after his interesting career in public life, is not saying that he supports fully and unequivocally all these grants of power to the executive.

**Mr. Bell:** Shame!

**Mr. Baldwin:** If so, he reminds me very much, in a political sense, of the chameleon which, it is said, if placed on a red rug will turn red, if placed on a brown rug will turn brown, and if placed on a scottish plaid will go mad.

**Mr. Olson:** I do not support the hon. member's interpretation.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Since the bill has been thrown open as a result of various amendments, I will not discuss any proposed changes to the bill. However, I should like to read an editorial which appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press*. That newspaper certainly does not support my party. I know it is having difficulty supporting the government at this time and I do not know where it stands now. Perhaps it supports my friends to my left.

**An hon. Member:** It could have changed.

**Mr. Baldwin:** This editorial of August 19, 1970, reads in part:

Because of the failure of Bill C-196 to be approved at the last session of Parliament, western wheat farmers are being penalized.

The bill failed to pass because opposition members, rightly, did not want to hand life-and-death control of the grain industry over to a few bureaucrats—which the legislation would have done. The government refused to remove the offending portions of the bill—

It refused to remove them in committee, and it is still refusing.

—and, as a result, it failed to get parliamentary approval—

There was universal approval for grading regulations under the Canada Grain Act, because they provided protection for the farmer in an era of uncertainty.

The government does not really understand simple things, but it would have been simple for the minister and the government to have sought an amendment to the old act and then, if further changes were needed, to have brought them in during the next session of Parliament. The proposals which would put large powers with regard to marketing and transport into the hands of bureaucrats who would control agriculture in this country are,

[Mr. Baldwin.]

I am convinced, not acceptable to the farmers of this country and will not be accepted. But the government does not see that; it wants the bill, the whole bill and nothing but the bill.

**Mr. Olson:** Our farmers have been asking for this bill for years.

**Mr. Baldwin:** That is the minister's interpretation.

**Mr. Horner:** Did the grains council want this bill?

**Mr. Olson:** I said the farmers wanted it.

**Mr. Baldwin:** The farmers of this country did not ask for this bill in its present form. They will become aware of what the government really wants, as they became aware of its intentions in connection with Bill C-197. It wants to secure a death-grip on the whole Canadian agricultural industry and run that industry from the ivory towers of the Department of Agriculture in Ottawa. If my friends to my left want that, they can have it. I do not want it and I know that the farmers in the Peace River country do not want it. I am convinced that most Canadian farmers do not want it.

**Mr. Olson:** That is another wrong interpretation.

**Mr. Baldwin:** If it should happen that every amendment presented at the report stage of the bill is passed, even then I say there would be a technical and major objection to the third reading of this bill. I will not become involved at this time in a discussion of the points of order which will have to be raised during the remainder of the present session or the next session, on third reading. I merely give the minister notice of a caveat.

This bill is objectionable because the consent of the Crown has not been secured to certain of its proposals. Also, it is bad because it is in direct violation of section 54 of the British North America Act. Those are fatal objections. Having the utmost faith in the judgment of the incumbent of the chair and in his application of law and common sense to the precedents of this House, I am convinced from my close examination of the bill that he will toss it out. I do not see how the bill can get past these fatal objections. I earnestly suggest to the minister that he look at it again. I will be only too glad to co-operate and give him the benefit of my opinions both in a legal and parliamentary sense.