

Canada Grain Act

presented in this Bill and therefore the deficit will be only \$2.2 billion. However, this still does not solve the dilemma facing those people.

Over the last five years, the program has been changed to the point where it is no longer on a financially sound footing. The combination of amendments made by the former Minister, Mr. Whelan, and by the current Minister, has changed the position of the program from having a net figure of just over \$1 billion in the fund to having a net deficit of something in the order of \$3 billion. In the short time of just five years, it has paid out approximately \$4 billion more than it has taken in. To me, this points out that recent amendments have made this a very shaky financial institution for the stabilization of grain incomes on the Prairies and sets the stage for a complete revamping of the stabilization attitude to grain production that exists right across Canada. It gives any future Government, a Government which my Party may form, an opportunity to introduce a new concept of income insurance that would in fact provide stabilization to individual farmers based on their production and their income, and would have a disaster component built into it in the event of the kind of drought or hail storms that occur on the Prairies or some of the local disasters that can occur in the rest of the country.

It is a great opportunity to see the program's failings as they exist. These amendments are an attempt to make the best we can out of a bad piece of cloth. It is a badly made coat which we are trying to wear to keep some of the rain out. With the experience we have had since the early 1970s, we can now see ways of making a much better income stabilization program for farmers, and I hope that we can have the opportunity to present such a program after the next election.

At this time, I have no major objection to the Government's attempt to make this badly fitting garment somewhat more waterproof. I hope we can therefore allow the Government to go through with the amendments, even though they do not correct the over-all problems that have existed with the western grain stabilization program from its inception right up to this time.

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief point of clarification. The Hon. Member who just spoke referred to producers joining before July 31 of this year, before the end of the current crop year. It is important to point out that the Bill has in fact provided for an extension of that deadline so that current non-participants would have a chance to join retroactive to August 1 of 1987. They will have, as I understand it, 60 days after proclamation of this Bill in which to join, which, as a practical matter, should run the deadline up to approximately October 1, and producers can rest assured that they will receive plenty of notice as to the actual deadline.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Clark (Brandon—Souris): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you may find that there is a unanimous

disposition on the part of Members of the House to consider Bill C-112 for third reading at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there such unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

CANADA GRAIN ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Frank Oberle (for the Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)) moved that Bill C-112, an Act to amend the Canada Grain Act and other Acts in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Parliamentary Secretary would have wished to speak first. If so, I would gladly give my place, and if not, I will make my remarks now. Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary can summarize, after having heard what other Hon. Members have said.

Mr. Nickerson: Let's get through with it.

Mr. Boudria: I think the Hon. Member across is not aware that we have had discussions in order to co-operate by giving the Government unanimous consent to proceed with third reading of this Bill today. This just goes to show that when it is reasonable to do so, the Opposition always co-operates with the Government. Sometimes we cannot co-operate with the Government when it is too unreasonable, but when it is reasonable, the Opposition can be reasonable as well, and I am sure that Canadians are noting the consent we are giving to the Government.

Bill C-112 is a Bill about which we have reservations because of a provision in the Bill. Nevertheless, we have conceded to giving that unanimous consent. That just goes to show the kind of co-operation that can exist.

The précis of the Bill provided by the Government to Members of the House states that the amendments to the Canada Grain Act provide for clarification and standardization of terminology used in the Act. That is true, of course, and we recognize that. It provides for the authority to establish by regulation, subject to Governor in Council approval, time limits for the deferral of pricing, the storage of grain in elevators and payments for grain by licensed elevators and grain dealers. That is true as well. It provides for the limitation of protection of securities posted within the commission to actual producers holding cash purchase tickets and the clarification of which documents are to be issued by licensed elevators for grain dealers. It provides for the consolidation of authority to establish and change grades by regulations of the commission subject to Governor in Council approval, the