

Canada Grain Bill

companies, Bill C-175 does not properly identify this. In the new bill the implication is that the terminal owns the grain and that the terminal, under all circumstances, must be able to deliver this against a warehouse receipt. There is confusion concerning whether or not a warehouse receipt is indeed exactly the same thing as the kind of ticket one receives for special bin grain, special bin grain being grain that is kept separate from other grain. If one receives a warehouse receipt designating a certain grade and quality of grain, the terminal is not obliged to deliver the same grain but can deliver grain equal to the grade indicated on the warehouse receipt that any individual or company may hold.

We are prepared to consider some changes in these items, but I advise the House there may be more. I do not deny that there could be other changes that would be necessary from time to time. I would hope, however, the House would be disposed to move on with the passage of this bill, the rewriting of the Canada Grain Act, even though we may not find every one of the flaws in it in the first instance. There are some principles involved in the grain handling business that ought to be changed. Indeed, in my view there has been too much delay now, but that is only my own personal opinion. I refer to such things as the statutory grades, including a protein factor, in setting out the schedule for certain grades and other mechanisms in respect of the grain handling system. These should be modernized for the benefit of everybody involved. So, I would hope, with the assurance I am prepared to give the House and the committee, that after the application of this new bill for any specified length of time, be it one year, two years or however long, we will be prepared to consider amendments based on the experience we gain in attempting to apply this act—

An hon. Member: I hope you will not still be the government.

Mr. Olson: Some members opposite hope we will not be the government. They do not need to advise me of that because I am aware of that every day of the week, but the people of Canada do not agree with them and so long as it is that way it is fine with me. Whether I or somebody else occupies this position, I am sure he will be prepared to reconsider any defects that arise as a result of applying this new act to the grain trade and will come to this House seeking amendments to improve it on the basis of that experience. But what I cannot accept is the holding up of anything of a major nature because we might not have thought of all the details. I can guarantee to hon. members in this House that no matter how well we examine this bill and try to anticipate every difficulty, since the grain trade today is changing there will be other changes we will have to deal with even four or five years from now. Hopefully even then, much to the chagrin of hon. members opposite, we will still be administering this country at the very high level at which it is being administered today.

I wish to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying to hon. members opposite I hope they will give favourable consideration to a suggestion I wish to make that this

[Mr. Olson.]

bill be reinstated in the same position—that is at the report stage—in which it was when the last session was prorogued. I might say that while there has been discussion there has been no commitment by members opposite that we do this. I plead with them now, for the sake of the producers, to agree to this proposal so that we can get on with bringing in what everybody agrees is a useful structure. If they fail to agree to that, then I hope they will send this bill to the committee bearing in mind it is a bill which has been given a great deal of consideration by the whole of the industry and indeed by the members of this House who are members of the Standing Committee. As I said there have already been 26 amendments since the original version was introduced in this House.

There may be a possibility that some discussion could reduce the number of amendments before this House. So far as I am concerned, however, I am not worried about that. What I am very concerned about is that the members of this House and of the committee, after having heard the amendments and arguments in support of them at least once or twice, will allow a vote to be held so that no further time will be lost. I think every member of this House and every member of the committee ought to be able to move the amendments they wish to move. However, I believe it is also a basic right of the members of the committee, after the argument has been heard once or twice, to have a decision made as to whether or not the amendments are in fact acceptable. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we approach the procedural requirements involved in getting this bill from a bill into the law of this land in that spirit, we would be doing the farmers and the rest of the grain industry in Canada a great service.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture, in his best tone of voice, has tried to leave the impression that the bill that is being presented here is an amended version of the bill presented last session and that those of us in the opposition who have had some doubt about its original intention should drastically change our minds. We should simply go along with him and, because of the lapse of time, should find ourselves in a position where we can revise our thinking simply in order to accommodate him. I am not prepared at this time to give him such an assurance because I had some reservations about the original bill and I still have some reservations about the bill before us now. May I point out first that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) plays second fiddle to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang), who is also responsible for the Wheat Board. Unfortunately, the Minister of Agriculture has not been able to convince either his colleague or the rest of the cabinet that this bill is in the best interests of Canadian agriculture. Six months ago the Minister of Agriculture rose in the House and said: "We cannot sell any wheat because we cannot give an assurance to our customers that we can produce wheat of a certain protein quality". A few months ago we found ourselves in an entirely different situation. Is there a credibility gap? Where has this statement come from? It came right from the minister.