Feb. 10, 1967

AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

you economically could convey grain by truck for 40 or 50 miles, and if our farms were very much larger so that each farmer would, perhaps, want to ship 1200 or 1500 bushels at a time to an elevator, I think we might very well conceive, in the first instance, this type of 75 elevator system.

Now, if you say 75 elevators, perhaps you will need 150 or 300 elevators. But, the principle is the same, in that it is going to involve more trucking, better roads, larger units both at the farms and of the trucks to make this work. Each one of these units is going to be much more expensive to operate than the present elevators as we know them. But I would like to suggest to you that one of the most important disadvantages of such a system, if we can visualize it theoretically, would be the lack of competition. I think the farmer in the west today benefits very, very greatly from the very aggressive competition which takes place between the elevator companies, both the private companies and the co-operatives, to receive the farmer's grain. He has the option at most delivery points of going to at least three, if not more, elevators with almost every load of grain he brings in to obtain the best grade and the best advantage as far as dockage is concerned. If he finds the particular agent to whom he is delivering does not always have space for him when he wants to deliver, he wil go to some other elevator company, and that company is so anxious to handle his grain and keep him as a customer that they will go to very great lengths to make sure space is made available. The farmer receives, to my mind, the very best service he can expect because of this competitive factor. If we are going to go to a theoretical single point, perhaps it would have to be administered by a governmental body. He would be deprived of the drive in the present competitive system which results in service, and I would like to suggest that the person who would lose the most would be the farmer producer.

Mr. LEFEBVRE: Thank you; a very good answer.

Mr. CROSSMAN: Mr. Chairman, during the questioning by Mr. Olson there was a remark that perhaps he was here to bell the cat. Well, I would like to say that I do not think any of the members are here to bell any cats. We are here to get as much information as possible and I hope by getting this information we will be instrumental in eliminating some of the problems pertaining to agriculture. In my case, I am as interested in the agriculture of the prairie provinces as much as I am in any of the agriculture from Halifax or Newfoundland to Vancouver. But one thing that amazes me—and this is my first trip to the western provinces—

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have a question, Mr. Crossman?

Mr. CROSSMAN: Yes, I have. I am working up to it. What amazes me is that in all other forms of industry drastic changes have taken place since the first world war and again since the world war II, and yet grain is still being handled in the way it has been handled since 1918. Has any study or real effort been made to try to modernize the way we handle grain in the elevators?

Mr. LEACH: Mr. Crossman, we in Winnipeg thoroughly enjoy your Buctouche product. Except that we have not found anything better, as I said before dinner, than the law of gravity for handling grain, we feel we have been doing quite a bit of work in attempts to modernize. One company with which I am associated tried building an all-concrete elevator in the country, for instance, a