

Canada Grain Bill

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 75 the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia) moved:

That Bill C-175, An Act respecting grain, be amended by

- (a) renumbering Clause 12 at page 13 as subclause 12(1);
- (b) by deleting the words, "other than a primary elevator," in line 18 of Clause 12 at page 13; and
- (c) by adding the following subclause to Clause 12 immediately after line 36 at page 13:

"Limitation" "(2) The Commission shall not, in operating any elevator as a primary elevator pursuant to paragraph (d) of subsection (1), purchase grain."

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I should like to support this amendment because the words "other than a primary elevator" raise some serious problems concerning the definition of a primary elevator in another clause, I believe clause 2. I think the addition of a subclause to clause 12 does, in fact, meet all the arguments advanced in the Standing Committee on Agriculture. I believe it is fair to say the argument advanced were to prevent the Canada Grains Commission from operating a primary elevator for the purpose of making sure the commission does not become involved in the business of competing directly with the elevator companies. Therefore, the addition of subclause 2, as provided in this amendment makes clear that the commission will not be in the business of buying grain directly from the primary producer. The existing Board of Grain Commissioners at the present time does operate a number of elevators, particularly interior elevators, which could and indeed would come under the definition of primary elevator if there should be direct deliveries from some farmers to those elevators.

I am sure hon. members will have no objection to the kind of facility which would permit these elevators to receive, for example, truckloads of grain. The reason we would not like to include the words "other than a private elevator" is that this would prevent the Board of Grain Commissioners receiving this grain directly from the producers or indeed directly by motor transport or truck delivery. Therefore, the addition of the words suggested by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) "the commission shall not, in operating any elevator as a primary elevator...purchase grain", I believe would

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

meet the arguments that were advanced in the committee and at the same time allow the commission to do those things that may be needed and which may be reasonable in the operation of interior elevators. There is a situation now, with rapeseed coming into some of the interior elevators, where we would be willing to accept grain directly by truckloads lots at those elevators, even though it came directly from the producers, provided it is assigned to these interior elevators by a grain company.

We do not intend to get into the grain business, and indeed the additional clause specifically prevents that. The problem is that under the definition "primary elevator", the grain commission would also be prevented from accepting these truck lots of grain directly from the producers, notwithstanding that it had come through the account of some grain company or grain co-operative. For those reasons, I would hope the House would be willing to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia.

● (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): I commend the minister for his explanation of the amendment, and I am inclined to support it. However, I think I would like to question the procedure here. Why did we not hear from the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) who is purported to have moved the amendment? Why do we engage ourselves in this hide and seek? Undoubtedly, the minister handed this amendment to the hon. member for Assiniboia to move, but why did he not place the full load on the hon. member for Assiniboia and have him explain it to the House? I do not understand this business of trying to pass on a little favour to the hon. member for Assiniboia so that he can get credit for moving the amendment, when in reality it is the brainchild of the Department of Agriculture and of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson). With those words, I tentatively wish to bring about corrective action by the Department of Agriculture. The minister need not be ashamed of moving this amendment. If it is his wish and his brainchild, he should put it forward.

If the hon. member for Assiniboia wants to boldly second the amendment or even take credit for this brainchild of the minister, he should rise and make a speech on the amendment, rather than expect the amendment to be passed without giving us his explanation of it and telling us why we should support it.

Now, I should like to speak to the amendment. This clause was debated at length in the committee on two previous occasions. Last June, the committee saw fit to vote the amendment down. The bill did not pass in the old session, so the amendment was put forward again. During the past summer recess, the committee saw fit to accept the amendment and voted in favour of it. As I remember it, the count was substantially in favour of the amendment.

What was the purpose of the amendment? The amendment is to clause 12, line 18, to delete from paragraph (d) the words, "other than a primary elevator,". It is no