

A memorandum dealing with the feedstuffs industry of the prairie provinces and outlining board regulations of deliveries to feed mills has been prepared by the board and some members of this committee may already have copies. We have additional copies of this document with us, however, and will be pleased to make it available to committee members who would like it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. McNamara, have you other copies of the statement you have just read?

Mr. McNAMARA: We had some for the press and for the committee reporters. We did not prepare copies for the members. We could do that, Mr. Chairman, if you would like. We could have these copies prepared at noon and have them available for all the members.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the desire of the members that they have copies?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. ARGUE: Since the wheat board's position and the Wheat Board Act has been upheld in the courts, do you feel there is any need to strengthen the present act, or the present regulations, to increase your powers, or to increase your control over the marketing of grain?

Mr. McNAMARA: No; I venture the opinion that the powers that we have are sufficient to enable us to control the quota system and to regulate the flow of grain into channels. It is a question of enforcement, however, and, as I indicated in this brief, during the period this matter was before the courts we felt we should refrain from further prosecutions until the legal points had been clarified. But since that time we have started to enforce our regulations and to see that the quota regulations are adhered to, not only by the feed mills but by all handlers of grain.

Mr. ARGUE: When did the Supreme Court refuse the appeal? In other words, when did you come into the position where you were able to enforce your regulations without fear of an adverse decision by the courts?

Mr. McNAMARA: Mr. Monk says about four months ago this was clarified.

Mr. ARGUE: What companies were involved?

Mr. McNAMARA: There were a number of individual companies.

Mr. ARGUE: But the two cases to which you referred? You took two test cases.

Mr. H. B. MONK (*Solicitor, The Canadian Wheat Board*): One case in Manitoba was against a person by the name of Klassen who operated a feed mill at Grunthal; and the case in Alberta was against Thumlert, who was an agent of the Midland Pacific Grain Company at Ponoka.

Mr. ARGUE: Mr. Chairman, since this has been cleared up by the courts, and since the Wheat Board is satisfied with the regulations and the law as it is at present in effect, I wonder if I might ask you such a simple question as to why there are meetings of the committee at all. Who has been pressuring to get these regulations changed and relaxed?

I made a strong speech in the house on it. I thought there was some doubt, perhaps—I am glad there is not—in the minds of the Wheat Board. There was certainly no doubt in the minds of the farm organizations. I wondered why the committee should spend its time, if the producers involved and the Wheat Board feel that the act is satisfactory, that it can be enforced, and that the quota system is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe it has been brought to the attention of the minister by the feed mills and other individuals in the prairie provinces.