

am very concerned about this because it will add to the over-all cost of production. I can visualize a situation where farmers will have to deliver grain 30 or 40 miles and we will find that many farmers will be not geared up to do it because they do not possess trucks of high capacity. There was a situation a year ago where farmers had to deliver rapeseed 100 miles away. Even if a farmer has a quota he may run into difficulty in such a case. When a truck is loading up without a scale, he may find that it is overloaded. This is a situation which the farmer is bound to run into. Last year the net result was a prosecution. But are we to be faced with a similar situation because the rule says "no quota"?

The hon. member for Crowfoot pointed out that the elevator system is running at something like 60 per cent of its capacity; Is this the pattern we are to live with? There can be no conclusion other than that the policies of this government are such that eventually the elevator operators will find their business is not a paying proposition. The commission will then tell them they must reduce their elevator system, and they will probably then face prosecution. What will happen to the producer then? Clause 35 (2) provides:

A licence issued pursuant to subsection (1) shall be

(a) for a term not exceeding five years; and

(b) subject to such conditions, in addition to any prescribed conditions, as the commission deems appropriate in the public interest for facilitating trade in grain.

It does not include the interest of the producer. It speaks of the public interest. What is the public interest, Mr. Speaker? The minister has told us we must reduce the effectiveness of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. That may be in the public interest but it is not in the producers' interest. If we were acting in the producers' interest we would maintain in full force the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. I therefore say there ought to be a different approach to payments.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The other day I suggested in the House that the elevator system, which includes the terminal elevator system, has a total capacity of 550 million bushels. Since only about 250 million bushels are to be accepted, this will mean that the income of western farmers will be reduced by 300 million bushels. I do not see how the problem is to be overcome. If the elevator system is not to be filled, how will you get any extra money into the hands of the producer? The Minister of Agriculture of the province of Manitoba suggested that \$300 million ought to be pumped into the farm economy immediately because Prairie farmers will receive \$700 million less than they received in 1969.

What this government intends to do is quite obvious. Under this bill as now drafted, the commission will have the right to close down an elevator at any point as it sees fit, and it can claim it is acting in the public interest. It does not have to take into account the interest of the producer. It has been suggested that rapeseed and barley

Canada Grain Bill

will go through the system. Senator McNamara suggested that both grain and barley should go into the system. Barley ought to go into the system, because if it does not we may lose our barley market. We may yet lose it because farmers will not grow barley at a loss. They will not grow barley merely for the sake of growing it.

We obtained a share of the market in the United States because of the corn blight in that country. The corn blight gave us a temporary market. The government's grain policy was geared with that fact in mind. The minister thought it might be a good idea to slip that policy under the rug, as it were. His idea is that once you get your foot in the door, you are all right. Well, he might sell the country on that idea this year; he may say that the government will put out some money at this time, but there is nothing to suggest that next year or the year after the same government policy will obtain.

The government's policy tells me that although we are asked to produce rye, flax, rapeseed, barley, oats and wheat there will be an eventual congestion not only of wheat but of all the other commodities I have mentioned. Apparently in the interest of stability the government is to hold back money earned from the sale of some commodities. They will not even trust me with my own money. They will hold back certain sums and dole the money out to me. I give my children quarters and dimes; I do not give them a dollar bill all at one time. That is exactly how the government is treating the farmers; it is that they do not know how to spend their money and therefore it will hold some of it back.

Also, if a farmer in one area does not make a very high income, the farmer in another area who has a higher income will pay out money for the benefit of the poorer farmer. In a sense, that is like insurance. I suppose everybody wants to enter into an insurance scheme of some kind. Certainly it will bring a certain measure of stability. But I do not want this if the government is to hold back my money, if it is going to say, "Look, we have held this money for you. Aren't we good boys?"

An hon. Member: Give them hell, Stan.

Mr. Korchinski: Those are some of the reservations about this measure that I felt I had to express at this time. In addition, under the provisions of clause 87, I believe, the elevator companies will not accept delivery of grain which may be out of condition or contaminated. The point I am making is this: the minister has not indicated in the House, although the matter was raised on several occasions, who is to be responsible if a loss results from grain that is contaminated with the rusty beetle, and so on. I am thinking of comments made by Mr. Hamilton of the Grain Commission who said that the farmer will have to carry this load. That statement contradicts statements made in the House to the effect that the farmer will not carry that load.