

*Supply—Transport*

The hon. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre endeavoured, along with myself, at the end of the crop year last fall to have these filled and the space utilized. One of the reasons given for the present state of affairs was the charge made by railways in connection with dropping this grain off.

● (3:50 p.m.)

For a 2,000 bushel car for the first year, the railway gets three cents per 100 pounds. If the wheat stays in the elevator for a second year the railway charges 5½ cents per 100 pounds, and for the third year seven and a half cents. These charges increase progressively; I do not have the further figures. But I feel this is a completely unfair charge because only one movement is involved; the grain is dropped off and unloaded, and the cars are moved out.

The argument in favour of this pricing system is that it is intended to compensate the railways for revenue lost temporarily by not being able to transport this grain to the ports. This brings me to the present situation in western Canada. The grain is not being moved and the railways, for some reason or another, seem to prefer not to move it. I suggest that these charges should be looked into immediately and that the Board of Transport Commissioners who are, I believe, responsible, should take action to revise them so that no railway can charge in respect of more than one drop-off. As I have explained, at the present rates the charge for the first drop-off is three cents per 100 pounds. If there is to be a drop-off charge, and if that is considered a fair figure, I suggest it should be the only charge, and that the railways should not be allowed to collect higher sums as time goes by.

We have to realize that this is a direct charge against the farmers' wheat. It is not in the form of a storage payment or anything like that. It is a deliberate charge and one which results in a smaller net return when the final wheat payment is made.

I referred earlier to the quota situation on the prairies. I should have called attention then to one particular station I had intended to mention. I think this example will illustrate the inequity of the delivery system at the present time. Today, as I said, there are 74 points in the province of Alberta still on a two bushel quota. I should point out, first of all, that in the 1964-65 season the first bushel quota was announced on September 14, the second on October 19, the third on November

23 and the fourth on January 4, 1965. One particular grain company had shipped, at that point, a total of only 104 cars of wheat from Aug. 1st 1964 to June 23, 1965, compared to 103 cars in the period Aug. 1 to Dec. 18, 1965.

Let us consider what has happened during the present crop year. This is the same town. It had a one bushel quota on August 30, a two bushel quota on September 27, a three bushel quota on October 25 and a four bushel quota on November 8. And it had lots of room. I am sure it is by mere coincidence that November 8 was the day on which they had the fourth quota. However, on January 10 my home town had a quota of six bushels, which is very good. It is on a C.N.R. line and I certainly cannot complain.

I should like to say a word or two, now, about one situation which I understand very well. It concerns the inefficiency of the railway, in this particular case, the C.N.R. I wish to refer to a question which I placed on the order paper on April 28, 1965. It is question No. 52 and reads as follows:

1. What are the names and business addresses of the various tenderers for the installation of sewer and water systems in the section house at Avonlea, Saskatchewan?
2. What were the amounts of each of these respective bids?
3. To what firm or person was the contract awarded?
4. When will the C.N.R. be calling for tenders for the installation of sewer and water systems in the station at Avonlea, Saskatchewan?

The answer I received was this:

The Management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows: 1, 2 and 3. Only Moose Jaw Heating and Plumbing Company Limited, of Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, responded to the invitation to tender and contract was awarded to that firm. It is not the policy to disclose the amount of tenders for railway contracts. 4. It is not known at the present time when such installations will be made.

My second question was on the same subject. It will be found reported in *Hansard* of June 10, 1965—question No. 424.

1. Who were the C.N.R. officials responsible for calling tenders for the installation of sewer and water systems in the section house at Avonlea, Saskatchewan?
2. Is it the practice of the C.N.R. to instal such facilities on C.N.R. properties for appearance sake only?

● (4:00 p.m.)

3. Are there sewer or water connections available for this property?
4. What is the deficit in this department of the C.N.R.?