

*Canada Grain Act*

is a marked change in the cost of operating a terminal elevator if there is a work stoppage and therefore no wages to pay. I believe very firmly that there should be provision to substantially reduce the charges to the producers for the storage in those terminal elevators when in fact, because of a work stoppage, there is no opportunity for the owners of the grain to have it discharged from those elevators. It is elementary or common justice that the owner of that grain, in most cases the producers in the name of the Canadian Wheat Board, should not be required to pay the full storage charges to the elevator company when there is a work stoppage.

Proposed amendment No. 37 was proposed in committee as a somewhat similar amendment, as recorded at page 81 of report No. 44. The amendment was negatived but a new subsection 2 was added to cover this point and was put into the bill at page 25 of report No. 45. Dealing with proposed amendment No. 38, this is designed to authorize mixing if a holder of the elevator receipt so desires. In my opinion it is inappropriate, in the interests of producers, to enlarge the circumstances under which mixing may be permitted without authority of the commission. This, of course, will be amplified to some extent in the regulations that are drawn following the passage of this bill.

Proposed amendment No. 39 proposes to amend clause 62. It seems that the purpose is to delete the requirement for written permission of the commission. This section now provides that permission may be given by the commission or by a representative. Such representative is likely to be, and in most cases will be, on location at the elevator. This proposal was discussed extensively in committee, so that the committee members who did in fact consider and amend this bill were not unaware of this matter.

Proposed amendment No. 40, to amend clause 70 (1), seems to be designed to permit trucking by custom truckers and to designate the Canadian Wheat Board as the regulatory body. This is unnecessary, because the clause gives the opportunity for approval of any person to the commission. Furthermore, the Canadian Wheat Board Act provides authority to carry out the business assigned to the Canadian Wheat Board. Proposed amendment No. 41 proposes to remove from the control of the commission the movement of grain to primary elevators by public carriers. This control is considered necessary, in my view, but the section provides for this type of movement when permission has been obtained

from the commission. This matter was also discussed extensively in the committee.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I now refer to proposed amendment No. 42, dealing with clause 71(3). The proposal deals with the allocation of railway boxcars at primary elevators in addition to producer cars. It seems to me that this provision is unnecessary and inappropriate because clauses 100 and 97, as well as the Canadian Wheat Board Act, cover the allocation of cars other than producer cars. Producer cars are covered by clause 71 of this bill. Clause 97 provides that the governor in council may direct the allocation of any railway cars. There is no point in elaborating greatly on this. I have been in the House on dozens of occasions when hon. members opposite have made representations to the government for this authority to be exercised by the government when, in the opinion of those hon. members, there was either an inappropriate or unfair allocation of boxcars between points or, indeed, in total. A provision is included to deal with that and, therefore, it does not seem to me it would be necessary or desirable to accept proposed amendment No. 42 dealing with clause 71(3).

Proposed amendment No. 43 deals with a new clause No. 101. This proposal would limit the duration of certain orders and regulations to a year without approval of a particular committee of the House. Mr. Speaker, with all the great respect I have for this House, I do not believe that any member of it really thinks that the committee of this House should change their responsibilities from those of lawmakers to those of administrators of that law. Those are the responsibilities of the government and its agencies, according to our constitution and the structure of our government. Certainly that would not be appropriate. It would be a completely new departure. In my opinion it would be wrong for the government and, indeed, the administration to restrict itself with this kind of amendment and this kind of provision in the bill. I predict that if we were to acquiesce in the amendment it would not take the committee long to realize that this change had placed a burden on it that was not appropriate or in keeping with its responsibilities as a law maker, and that it is not necessarily an administrator of government policies.

Proposed amendment No. 44 deals with clause 106(3). It proposes to allow the commission to follow the old grading system, whereas current clauses restrict that action to pre-