

Canada Grain Bill

sideration of a measure advanced for study by the Government. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has suggested this might be a point which could be considered by the Committee on Procedure and Organization. I agree with that. If I were asked to make a ruling now, I would tend to make a ruling that all that is required under our rules and Standing Order 62 is to have a recommendation come forward: it might not be necessary to have it in detail but, the regulations and our Standing Orders, in particular Standing Order 62(1) and 62(2) might be entirely satisfied by a recommendation in general terms as submitted to the House.

This would be *obiter dictum* at the present time because I have not ruled that, and in my view it may be that the explanation given by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) is sufficient and that the recommendation as it stands, if it were required to be in detailed form, is sufficient.

If the matter were raised again it may be at that point a decision would have to be made by the Chair as to whether a detailed recommendation covering all aspects of the bill should be necessary, but this would be a matter which could be considered at that time. Hon. members are now on notice, in any event, that this is a matter of importance and of interest, I am sure, to the whole House. If the point of order is raised again, I would expect to hear further from the hon. members who have taken part in this debate today and, I am sure, from other hon. members who have been placed on notice, as a result of which they will give this matter serious thought. For the moment, I would suggest that we proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, a great deal of public discussion throughout the grain growing areas of this country and, indeed, in this House has taken place in respect of the provisions now envisaged in Bill C-175. There have been several days of debate in this House, which I considered to be useful debate, as well as a great deal of discussion in the Standing Committee on Agriculture when the predecessor to this bill, that is Bill C-196, was under consideration by that committee.

If my memory serves me correctly, there were 26 amendments made to Bill C-196 by the committee on agriculture. I suggest this was a very useful exercise because there is no doubt that when a government proposes to introduce a bill of the size of the one that is before us, which is really a re-writing of the whole of the Canada Grain Act, and this is done after a period of nearly 40 years, it is perfectly understandable and indeed desirable that there be a great deal of debate, that there be far-ranging discussions in the industry from the producers all the way through, and that all of these discussions should be taken into account. I suggest this has been done.

There were many people from producer organizations who appeared before the committee. There were a large number of trade associations as well as individual companies which made their views known to us in respect of

a number of proposals in Bill C-196. In addition to that, a new dimension has been added to the consideration of the Canada Grain Act since the last time it was revised, that is the organization known as the Canada Grains Council. As you know, this council is made up of producer organizations involved in co-operative wheat pools, other grain companies, the railways, the terminals and everyone else involved in the business. The council undertook the responsibility of examining the details of Bill C-196 and then presented its recommendations to various people involved in a series of different procedures.

First, there were a great number of discussions carried on between the Board of Grain Commissioners and the people involved in the trade. Then, there were discussions certainly with Members of Parliament and other people respecting revisions to the Canada Grain Act. Of course, to highlight and perhaps summarize all of these previous discussions, the Canada Grains Council did in fact appear before the Standing Committee on Agriculture giving their considered opinion in a very detailed way as to what was desirable and perhaps what ought to be changed slightly in the proposal that was before the committee at that time, namely Bill C-196.

I can never claim that a bill is perfect. I suggest there may be some minor amendments, perhaps even some major ones, that will need to be taken under consideration when Bill C-175 gets to the committee. In fact, there never was any doubt in my mind that when we undertook to completely re-write the Canada Grain Act, which contains in its new form some 116 clauses as well as the schedules and the annexes that are added thereto, it would be a miracle if that were written in perfect terms the first time.

What has happened has been that the bill before us now is the result of the best efforts of the Board of Grain Commissioners, in consultation with their advisers, both legal and experts in the trade. These drafting instructions were presented to this House and the standing committee. I believe the number of amendments made by the committee was 26. There were more proposed but there were in fact 26 amendments made. There may be more needed. In fact, I am prepared to consider favourably some amendments which may be considered technical by some, or matters of substance by others. For example, I have been advised that there was a provision in the old Canada Grains Act which dealt with matters respecting insurance, and that the companies indicated that "acts of God" or the "Queen's enemies", which are not provided for in this bill, ought to be put in because there could be a substantial difference in the insurance premiums to be paid if these two exemptions were not made. It seems to me this, in fact, could be done when we reach the committee stage or even at the report stage. I would be happy if we should be able to have this bill moved along to the point at which it was at the last session.

● (4:20 p.m.)

I understand there is also a small problem related to special bin grain that has been drawn to our attention. I am advised that, in the opinion of a number of grain