

*Canada Grain Bill*

Then, this minister comes in here. He is a kind of second-rate minister anyway. He comes in only at the behest of the minister from Saskatchewan, in order to maintain his status as a minister, and he says, "I have got to get this bill through." Why are we raising these objections? It is because it is going to cost us money. Some \$70 million that was paid into the grain storage business is not going to be paid any more, and this bill indicates we are going to get rid of the elevators.

I used to deliver a little bit of grain in my day. When I first started trucking, a half cent a bushel per mile was what I charged. I don't know if that is the normal rate now. I am not in that business any more and perhaps I am behind the times in that regard. This was the normal rate we charged years ago, and I imagine some of the truckers today charge something like that, or probably a progressively bigger rate. But a farmer may have to deliver 25 or 30 miles because you must remember that this bill gives authority to get rid of the elevators all the way down the line. That is just one step. The next step is the elimination of the railways, which means the elimination of communities.

This minister asks us to go along with this omnibus bill. There are pages and pages of it. I am not ready at this particular stage to tell the minister that we in the opposition are going to destroy all these communities that he would like to destroy. He has a master plan, or perhaps it is the other minister who obviously has much more power than he has. Mr. Speaker, sometimes there are frictions within cabinet that are not too obvious to many people. But this minister is on the way out. This minister slid in quietly, and the Liberals accepted him. We wished him luck. We thought he was really going to do things for us. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this minister is quickly slipping out because he has not got a path into the Prime Minister's office. He has no way by which he can convince the Prime Minister that this bill is what he wants because he does not want it himself. How can he convince the Prime Minister when he is told by the other minister that this is what is necessary? It is the other minister who is making the speeches on the subject.

I have watched the performance—I have had to because this is my business—as I think most of the other members of the House have. Whatever regard we had for him as an individual, we are seeing the erosion of his power by the other minister who is gradually working himself up because the other minister does as the Prime Minister tells him.

Of course, what does the Prime Minister tell him? He told him, quite simply, "Why should I sell your wheat?" Put it in terms like that and anything can happen from there on in. He is not going to sell your wheat because he is not going to give you any more money for the production of that wheat. If in the process we were led to believe that this bill was in our interests, then we would be the first to be accused.

The other day I voted for the invocation of the War Measures Act. I believed this was necessary government action, but after a few days the Prime Minister pointed an accusing finger at the opposition and said, "You voted

[Mr. Korchinski.]

with us, so what do you want?" I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have to be very critical. In fact this is my job as an opposition member, particularly when I see other flaws in this bill. I will vote with the government if I think that is necessary, but the other day the Prime Minister tried to humiliate me for voting with the government. Whenever I think the government is not adopting the right approach, I am going to speak out against it at every opportunity.

What about our rapeseed position? This is a grain that is gradually being accepted in the world market. We are not being told how the government is going to deal with it under this bill, whether storage will be provided or anything like that. The minister has indicated that he is ready to accept certain amendments, but he told us last spring that we were doing a disservice to the country because we objected to the predecessor of this bill. He told us they could not sell any wheat if this legislation was not passed. Protein grading was emphasized. We now find that this is not the story at all.

At that time, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) rose in the House and asked, "Would you be prepared to accept a proposal whereby we agree to introduce protein grading into the existing bill, and from there on in we will argue the difference?" The minister was the first to object to that, because there was more to the legislation than appeared on the surface. His big argument was protein grading, and now all of a sudden we have to swallow this whole bill.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the farmers are not as stupid as the minister thinks they are. They know that the minister could have introduced a short bill without any debate in this House, and if that was what they needed that was what they could have had. I give him my word right now that I have the assurance of every one of my colleagues that they would agree to that, and I am sure the other members of the opposition would see the wisdom of that course. But we are not going to sell all these towns down the drain, which is exactly what is intended.

I know how these elevator agents work. I have talked with them. I am sure the minister has occasionally stopped in at elevators and watched some of their operations. Small towns collect perhaps half their taxes from elevators, and if these elevators were eliminated that would mean the end of such towns. In an area such as that which I represent, which depends wholly and solely on such establishments, this bill will write finis to whole communities. Surely, the minister does not want nor expect that. If he wants protein grading, then let him say so and we can argue the other point. But he wants more, and I am not willing to give him more. When the minister from Saskatchewan says he can sell 700 million bushels of grain, good luck to him and to the rest of the farmers. I hope they sell a billion bushels. This would be the greatest thing that ever happened, for the economy though it would mean defeat to some of us. But we must be very careful that this country does not fall headlong because of a one shot deal. Though we sell a billion bushels of grain, we must not lose whole communities in