rate. In other words, if I were an agent of a grain company I would go to the banks to borrow \$100 million for the storage of grain in my company but I would receive only \$90 million, with interest on \$100 million. The higher rates and insecurity as a result of clause 15 of the bill will be passed right back to the producer.

There is another clause in the bill in respect of which I have an amendment. It is clause 41. Clause 41 suggests that the unions, in my interpretation of the clause, will be given greater bargaining power at the bargaining table. What concern, or what government—I say this in light of the government's recent problems in respect of the Post Office—has any real strength at the bargaining table where a labour union is concerned? There is no strength in the hand of business or in the hand of government. The strength in today's society is solely in the hands of the unions. Clause 41 of this bill specifically gives the unions greater strength. There is no change which would withstand the power now within the unions to strike and the subsequent effect of such a strike. So to my mind there is no doubt that the bill is in error in respect of that clause.

Another major problem which I find unacceptable in respect of Bill C-196 is this. Today we have the Canadian Wheat Board which handles all the problems in respect of wheat and grain marketing within the designated area. It provides for orderly marketing. Within that area it provides for a marketing agency and, in effect, a pricing agency in respect of international trade. This bill sets up powers within the Board of Grain Commissioners which definitely challenge the Canadian Wheat Board in more than one situation. Consider, for example, clause 59 of the bill, which suggests that the Board of Grain Commissioners has the right to approve mixing at the terminals. Until now the Wheat Board has been the seller and the pricer. It has put a grade of wheat on the market at a price, and it has had permission to mix all grains at the terminal except for grades 1, 2, 3 and 4. Clause 59 of the bill states that the mixing of grades at the terminal will be within the power of the Board of Grain Commissioners.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I dealt in the committee with the question of the split jurisdiction between the Board of Grain Commissioners and the Canadian Wheat Board as well as other matters. I asked

Mr. Monk, legal adviser to the Canadian Wheat Board in days gone by—I do not know whether he will be the legal adviser to the Board of Grain Commissioners—which board had the authority to make various rulings. Mr. Monk said that he guessed the decision of both would be required. No piece of legislation will ever prove successful unless jurisdiction is given to one board only. The two boards should not be allowed to squabble at some port or delivery point. Authority must be given to one board, which must be the supreme board. If that board wishes to establish several other boards under its jurisdiction, that is fine, but the authority of one board must be clearly established. This bill in fact interferes directly with the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. I will not go into the question of whether the Canadian Wheat Board has become the sacred cow in the grain handling industry. I believe some changes should be made to the Wheat Board, but not such that would challenge the authority of that body with regard to mixing and grading of proteins.

Another area in which split jurisdiction arises is in grading. The Wheat Board is the seller, the pricer and the person who seeks out customers. This bill, however, suggests that the Board of Grain Commissioners should establish the standards and change the grades in order to meet the demands of the customers. The Wheat Board is in the forefront; it meets the demands of the customers and therefore it alone should be the adviser and the authoritative body with regard to the changing of grades. The Board of Grain Commissioners directly interferes with the operations of the Wheat Board.

Another area in which it interferes with the operations of the Wheat Board is in the allotment of box cars. Until now the Wheat Board has had supreme authority in the allotment of box cars to a particular delivery point. In this bill it is not clear which board has that authority. There is some question as to whether the Wheat Board will have the authority or whether it will be given to the Board of Grain Commissioners. I make those three points, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I made particular note of the time when I rose to speak. I started to speak at 8.50 p.m. I am allowed 40 minutes.