

Canada Grain Act

The objection raised to that suggestion in the committee was that one system or the other would have to prevail. If the wheat pool obtained its fair share of the shipping orders and its fair share of the box cars, it should be left to the wheat pool to allocate its box cars among its different shipping points. If you tried to interfere with that by vote of the patrons at each station it would throw the whole system into confusion. It was suggested that it should be left to the management of the wheat pool. If it got its fair share of the orders and of the box cars, it should be left to the wheat pool management to allocate box cars fairly as among different shipping points, but that was a matter that should be left to the wheat pool management. They could be trusted to deal fairly with their patrons without being bound down by law, which would introduce an element of confusion into the whole situation.

As I have already said, Mr. Speaker, the committee on agriculture and colonization unanimously recommended this proposal, that when the wheat board allocated its shipping orders, and the different companies allocated their shipping orders to the various shipping points, the railroads would have the amount of grain that was supposed to be shipped out at each shipping point by each elevator company. They would know the proportionate amount of grain to be shipped out by the pool, by the United Grain Growers and by the other companies, and the wheat board should issue instructions to the railroads that they must allocate box cars according to the shipping orders they had in their hands. In that way there would be an automatic carrying through of the allocation by the wheat board of the shipping orders to the various companies.

As I say, that was recommended unanimously by the committee on agriculture and colonization. It would therefore seem to me, Mr. Speaker, in view of the unanimous recommendation of the committee, that it would be out of order for this house now to pass a bill which would set up a different state of affairs from what was unanimously recommended by the committee which studied this matter. So we may deal with this matter in an orderly way I propose to move in amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Jutras):

That all the words after "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"this bill be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that the wheat board allocation of shipping orders be carried through by the wheat board issuing instructions to the railways to spot box cars at elevators at each shipping point in proportion to the wheat board orders approved for that point, as recommended in the second report of the committee on agriculture and colonization made to this house on June 9, 1955."

Mr. W. M. Johnson (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, we have just had another typical indication of the attitude of the government in its attempt to skirt around a problem that it cannot decide itself. I think the hon. member for Rosthern, in presenting the argument that the standing committee on agriculture and colonization had come to definite conclusions, misled the house by saying there was a unanimous endorsement by that committee of the principle he has portrayed in his amendment. To the best of my knowledge an amendment was moved to that particular section in the agriculture committee, but in regard to that principle the wheat board officials—

Mr. Tucker: On a question of privilege, I stated that this recommendation was approved unanimously by the committee on agriculture and colonization, and the hon. member knows that is quite true. That committee unanimously approved of this recommendation.

Mr. Johnson (Kindersley): Technically speaking, the hon. member for Rosthern is right, in so far as the committee had had referred to it for consideration the reports of the Canadian wheat board and the board of grain commissioners, which had to be approved by the committee. There was an amendment moved to this particular section, to incorporate the principle of allowing farmers the privilege of delivering grain to the elevator of their own choice, a principle that all the members supporting the government fought against.

Mr. Tucker: I will ask the hon. member—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Tucker: —if he did not vote—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Tucker: —for this particular—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kindersley has the floor and should not be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. Johnson (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I was making reference to the right of the farmer to deliver grain to the elevator of his own choice. This principle has been ignored over the years in the allocation of box cars because of the arbitrary method of the elevator companies to allocate box cars to each elevator completely ignoring the desires of the farmers. I think it is fairly obvious that if the president of the Saskatchewan wheat pool, representing the farmers of that province, the president of the Manitoba wheat pool, the president of the Alberta wheat pool and the president of the interprovincial farm union council were unable to convince the government members sitting in the committee of the desirability of allowing farmers to