

to be for the producer and the common man, and the NDP can like it or lump it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: Members of the NDP can keep on hollering; it doesn't bother me a bit.

What happened, Mr. Speaker? The case went on month after month in the courts. One farmer stood the costs and what did the court find? Finally, the court made a decision. The farmer got an absolute discharge. The judge said it was a sensible thing to do. The Wheat Board was condemned.

● (1120)

This is one case and I hope it never happens again. I support the Wheat Board, but everything the Wheat Board does is not lily white. When they start to pick on the producers who created them, it is time for someone to step in and take some action.

I believe in the work of the Administrator. I believe in the resolution of the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson). He knows the score. He lives on the farm. He knows the good and the bad. He knows the black and the white. He still supports the Canadian Wheat Board but he wants this amendment included, and I want it included. We want to give the Administrator every possibility to do his job so that producers are looked after. I say again for the benefit of the NDP: "Look after the producers; forget about the corporation, it can look after itself".

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Motions Nos. 39 and 40. I am not sure that has been the case this morning up until now, having listened to the remarks of the previous speakers. Basically we have a choice before us as to which set of wording will make clear in the new Act that the Canadian Wheat Board will continue to have power to allocate cars and to pick up the grain it needs to fill its marketing programs. It buys grain from farmers, finds markets for it overseas and connects the shipping in between.

On the surface the difference between the two amendments is not that great. There is a very real technical difference which leads us to recommend Motion No. 40 over Motion No. 39. Motion No. 39 simply makes a motherhood kind of statement. Motion No. 40 refers directly to the Canadian Wheat Board Act and is very specific about which powers it wants to retain with the Wheat Board as opposed to leaving some doubt as to whether the powers go to the Administrator. I think we should opt for the most explicit motion.

The effective clause in Motion No. 39 which was put forward by the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson) reads:

—the Administrator do not restrict the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board under the Canadian Wheat Board Act to make available the quantities and types of grain necessary to achieve sales commitments on behalf of, and in the interests of, producers.

Western Grain Transportation Act

It is rather vague. The Speaker said that Motion No. 40 will be dealt with only if Motion No. 39 is defeated. It refers specifically to the powers in the Canadian Wheat Board Act. It reads:

The provisions of this Part respecting the duties and functions of the Administrator do not restrict the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board under section 21(k) of the Canadian Wheat Board Act,—

Section 21(k) allows the Wheat Board to provide for "the allocation of available railway cars for the shipment of grain at any delivery point, other than cars placed pursuant to a car order book, to any elevator, loading platform or person at such delivery point." It very specifically indicates that the Wheat Board has the power to allocate cars to the exact points where they will find the grain required to fill their markets.

In light of the speeches and the comments in the House, perhaps it would be in order, since we are dealing with the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board, to review why these powers are necessary, what farmers have done to get us to the point where we have the existing Canadian Wheat Board, and why it is important to maintain those particular powers within the Board so that it can continue to do the job it was designed to do.

● (1125)

Very briefly, early on in the settlement of the West it was clear to farmers that they had to do something about the marketing of their grain as opposed to the dumping they were forced to do at the outset. Initially the railways put in rail lines. They decided which elevator companies would gather grain from those lines.

Mr. Fisher: What about the topic?

Mr. Althouse: This is very much on the topic. Read the amendment. Because of that monopoly in each area, there was much political agitation by the farmers to get the Manitoba and Canada Grain Acts. Once they had a system under the Canada Grain Commission of guaranteeing they would be paid for the kind and grade of grain which they delivered, they focused on the elevator system.

Even though the elevators had a grading system in place according to the law and regulations, they very often did not obey those regulations and were mis-weighing and mis-grad-ing. Therefore, there was a lot of pressure put upon the provincial and federal Governments to establish a Government elevator system that would be a further appendage to the Canadian Grain Commission. That was very difficult to bring about.

In some of the provincial elections around 1910, 1911 and 1912, provincial Governments were elected on a platform of introducing government elevators. We had a typical response from the Liberal Party elected at that time on that platform. They put it in as a platform because they needed the votes. They also had a philosophy which they made very clear in the election. It was that governments cannot run business enterprises as well as business enterprises can. After the election, they began to implement their promise of having government