

*Canadian Wheat Board Act*

I support this motion because, for some unexplained reason, the Government has been unwilling to deal with this issue logically. During committee hearings, a suggestion similar to this motion was brought up, and the suggestion that there are no other costs for producer cars is absolutely illogical. Consequently, there is a need to deal with the costs of producer cars in a comprehensive way. That is all we are suggesting in this motion. We should look at the cost of producer cars and decide how much of it should be returned or needs to be returned.

There are two or three possible ways of proceeding with this particular Bill. We could eliminate the clause altogether, which is what my motion suggested, or we could put in a clause which would deal with producer cars in a comprehensive way, or we could drop the Bill entirely and start over. However, there are some things in the Bill which the Government feels it needs, so that option is unlikely.

There are some benefits from producer cars and there are some liabilities. It is like a balance sheet. We want to be able to put the total picture in front of the farmers and the people who use producer cars, add the credits, subtract the debits and possibly pay that amount. There should not simply be an *ad hoc* approach, allowing the Wheat Board to try to make a decision, arbitrary or not, as to how much a producer should be paid.

At this time, the producer knows what he will get out of using producer cars. It is possible that he may even lose money if the Wheat Board decides it wants to do this in a different way.

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, in the interests of brevity, I will make only two or three points in an attempt to address the concerns raised by both Hon. Members.

First, I want to make it clear that we are talking about a recommendation by the Wheat Board that certain moneys currently being paid by the users of producer cars for services which they do not receive will be remitted to them. It is important to remember that at the moment they are being charged for services which they do not receive.

The Bill itself only goes part way in addressing the concerns of producer cars. This is enabling legislation in which the Wheat Board would make a recommendation to the Minister which would then go to Cabinet and, by Order in Council, a percentage of the fees involved would be remitted to the users of producer cars. It is clear that they would continue to pay a certain amount to the country elevator system for services which they do not receive, but presumably that would be just in the sense that all prairie grain producers would benefit from the presence of the producer car system.

I would also remind Hon. Members that we are not talking about huge amounts. For example, at the moment, the storage and interest charges currently being paid for wheat by the users of producer cars is \$2.68 per tonne. For barley, it is \$1.62

per tonne. This Bill would permit the remission of a certain percentage of that amount, that percentage to be determined by Order in Council.

I think this is fair. It is perhaps a typical Canadian compromise. It goes down the middle in terms of addressing the concerns of producer car users while at the same time recognizing the need for the continued presence of the country elevator system.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The question is on Motion No. 1, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five Members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Pursuant to Standing Order 13(5), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred until six o'clock p.m. on Monday, July 11, 1988.

• (1410)

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert)** moved:

Motion No. 3:

That Bill C-92 be amended by deleting Clause 8.

**The Acting Speaker Mr. Paproski:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those opposed will please say nay.