

the process and it looks as if this is what the minister is trying to do here.

● (4:50 p.m.)

In submissions made earlier this year, the elevator companies indicated that they could handle that grain about as cheaply as is possible and as quickly as possible. Though I have reservations myself, the block system has demonstrated to some people that it will work in getting out certain grades of grain. This system is still in its growing stages, but I am willing to give it a try.

I think the minister will agree that the elevator companies must fully co-operate with him. If you are not going to pay the elevator companies, then who are you going to pay? Maybe the treasury of Canada will save \$71 million or \$72 million if the government is not going to pay these charges in another year. If the system which was recently announced is introduced, it will mean this amount will have to be taken out of the total income of farmers. The hon. member for Assiniboia had better start asking for farm storage payments for grain stored on his own farm because he will have to keep it there. If he does not want to keep it in elevators he is going to have to store it on the farm.

Although there were good and fruitful discussions in committee, Mr. Speaker, because of the ramifications of this measure, I think we must ask the minister to remember that whole communities will be affected. Much as I am unhappy with things that have happened in the past, I am not ready to sell these towns "down the river", if you wish.

An hon. Member: If you wish.

Mr. Korchinski: No, your town too, along with mine. It has been going down very rapidly through no fault of ours. I say it is all wrong to set up a central terminal system of elevators under this bill and somebody is going to be hurt in the process. This is a disruption which we cannot allow at this particular time.

I am not happy with what has been happening. If the recent announcement made by the minister from Saskatchewan was his own work, then he should have been handling this bill because it goes along with his line of thought. I am sure our present Minister of Agriculture does not agree with him, but apparently he does not have very much to say about it. He is doing the chores because the Prime Minister says he will either do them or get out of the cabinet. He has to push this bill through or get out, though he disagrees with what is happening. I am sure he does because I can remember a time when he sat three seats away from me here on the opposition side. He was a Social Credit member and when we discussed these things we were in agreement on a lot of them. What has happened to him since then?

Mr. McCleave: Money.

Mr. Korchinski: Just for a handful of silver he left us. It is a sad day, Mr. Speaker, when a minister finds

Maternity Leave Act

himself in the position where he does not want to introduce a bill, knowing the consequences of it, but in order to stay in the ministry he has to go along with what has been directed from above.

I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills and notices of motion.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

MATERNITY LEAVE ACT

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN FEDERAL JURISDICTION BEFORE AND AFTER CHILDBIRTH

On the order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration of Bill C-6, an act respecting the employment of women in federal jurisdiction before and after childbirth. (As reprinted by order of the House Friday, October 30, 1970)—Mrs. MacInnis.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The House is surely aware of the fact that Bill C-6, was reprinted as the result of an order of this House passed with unanimous consent on October 30. It is the feeling of the Chair that the motion should be put again which shall be done immediately.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway) moved that Bill C-6, respecting the employment of women in federal jurisdiction before and after childbirth be read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

She said: Mr. Speaker, this is the third session in which I have endeavoured to bring this matter to the attention of the House. In previous sessions it has been too far down the list, but this time by the luck of the draw it was more fortunate. Now, thanks to the co-operation of members on both sides of the House it has been possible for the bill to be altered so that I could bring it here for debate this afternoon. I should like to thank all members for their courtesy.

This is a very important issue. The principle of maternity leave has been supported by women's organizations across Canada in growing numbers, and by women who recognize its far-reaching significance. The bill is not as broad as I could wish but under the rules of the House it must be limited to women in employment under federal jurisdiction, that is federal undertakings of various kinds as well as employment covered by the Public Service Employment Act. This matter of providing protection for women through maternity leave is a test of our sincerity. If we are sincere when we proclaim our belief in equality for women in employment, we must do more than concern ourselves merely with equality in wages, hours, working conditions and promotion, important and neces-