

and often are sold by grade as well. My observations of any samples of screenings that I have examined, for example, the screenings contained a greater or lesser, and usually a greater, percentage of weed seeds.

Q. Don't you think that is a rather dangerous practice in so far as infestation of farms by weeds goes?

Mr. JUTRAS: This is getting into quite a bit of questioning.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we will let Mr. Phelps continue reading his submission.

Mr. ARGUE: I think I have the right to ask a question here.

Mr. DECORE: I thought it was agreed that the witness would finish his brief and then he would be asked questions by the members. There are a lot of questions that I would like to ask, too, as the witness goes on.

The WITNESS: Very well, then, Mr. Chairman.

### *Revision of Inspection Fees*

On previous occasions we have urged, and again recently requested, to have inspection fees on samples of grain sent in for inspection directly by individual farmers themselves be discontinued. The Canada Grain Act and the Board of Grain Commissioners are supposed and intended to exercise very definite and regulatory control on the movement of grain. Provision of this service was not intended to be used as a means of providing new revenue to the federal treasury. Since this new charge was imposed, we note there has been a considerable increase in revenue which was mainly paid by farmers. The ready use of the inspection department as an official check, providing the only protection the farmer has to safeguard his interest in matters of grain grading, is of utmost importance. Surely it should, at all reasonable times, be readily available to him without additional cost. We would therefore urge that the recently imposed fee of \$1.00 per sample be discontinued insofar as it applies to the samples sent in by individual farmers.

### *Amendments to the Canada Grain Act*

The three farm unions urge that pending an investigation of the whole grain handling business previously referred to in this brief, certain amendments to the Act be provided for immediately as their need appears obvious.

First we request an amendment to section 138 and 138A, subsection 2 in each case to provide that where proceeds of the sale of overages are being paid to Her Majesty, such proceeds shall be paid over to the Canadian Wheat Board for inclusion in the final payment back to farmers on a pro-rated basis calculated on the number of bushels delivered. Further amendment to these sections to provide that country elevators shall be brought under the same regulations in regard to the confiscation of grain overages of wheat and other grain as that which will apply under the proposed new amendment to the operations of the terminal elevators. We would further recommend that the term "public terminal elevator" as used in section 138 and the term "Eastern elevators" as used in section 138A should both be changed using the terms "all terminal elevators". This would then include all public semi-public and private terminal elevators as we feel it is in the public interest it should do.

We would also recommend that the Act be amended to delete those sections which provide for an off-set of shortages against overages and to prevent the inclusion of any amount whatsoever as represented by shrinkage allowance being set off against grain overages. While we are not averse to a proper shrinkage allowance, provided it is fixed at or as near as possible to the actual amount that grain does shrink in handling on the average, we do object most violently to it being used as an offset; and if this practice