

Canada Grain Act

Mr. Pickersgill: That is a contradiction of terms.

Mr. Argue:—the suggested amendments to the Canada Grain Act embodying the same principle found in Bill No. 22 now under discussion. We were told they did not have a bill, but a bill was produced a few weeks later. In the meantime the farmers could not deliver their grain to the elevator of their own choice.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): On a question of privilege, I do not wish to enter the debate again but I received no bill from any pool. I received a list of recommendations in much the same form that the hon. member received them, but I received no bill that was in legal form or could be considered as a bill.

Mr. Argue: I shall read a part of what I have in my hand, which was handed to the minister—

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): Read it all.

Mr. Argue:—and let anyone reading the record decide for himself whether it was a draft bill in legal terms or whether—

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): Read it all.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the hon. member cannot be allowed to do that under the rules. He has told us that he has a purported draft bill in his hands which came from an outside person. The minister has just made the statement that he received no bill, nothing that could be considered to be a bill. The hon. member must accept his statement and not attempt to deny the statement made by the minister by reading a document emanating from a person outside the house.

Mr. Argue: Mr. Speaker, I naturally have to accept the interpretation the Minister of Trade and Commerce places on whatever piece of paper was exchanged between the wheat pool organizations and the minister. If he does not wish to call it a bill I shall take his interpretation of it, but I suggest with deference that there is nothing in the rules of parliament to make me refrain from quoting a suggestion that has already been placed before a committee of the house on this subject. The document presented to the minister is entitled, "Amendments to Canada Grain Act" and reads:

Re: Producers' preference.

60 (a) The board shall annually forward to all producers at their address as shown by the records of the Canadian wheat board, a form which shall make provision for the producer: (1) To declare the name and location of the country elevator to which he prefers to deliver his grain for the current crop year.

(2) To state his seeded acreage of each kind of grain for the current year. The board upon return of the completed form shall prepare a statement

[Mr. Argue.]

of the total acreage preferences for each licensed country elevator, at each point, together with such further information as it may require and shall forthwith determine a cycle of cars to be allotted at each shipping point. In determining a cycle of cars for a point, the board shall divide equally among the licensed elevators operating at such point the acreage for which no preference has been stated. To this acreage so allotted to each elevator shall be added the acreage for which a preference has been declared in favour of an elevator and the combined total shall be the percentage of each elevator's total cars to be allotted to it for the succeeding crop year in accordance with its proportionate cycle.

That is the end of paragraph (a). Then it sets out paragraphs (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f), and concludes with this further paragraph:

Add to section 15 of the Canada Grain Act authority by regulation, specifying the mode in which cycles of cars shall be determined for the distribution among country elevators.

I leave it to members of the house whether the minister was justified in making the statement he made when answering a question of mine in this debate on May 13. As recorded at page 3756 of *Hansard*, I put the following question to the minister:

May I ask the minister a question? Does the Alberta wheat pool not support the Saskatchewan wheat pool in the ideas that have been presented about box car allocation?

Here is the minister's answer:

We know that ideas have been presented jointly, but as I say no wheat pool has submitted a bill for the consideration of the government which meets the approval of any one of the three wheat pools. I have not received such a bill up to this time.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): If I may interrupt again, I made the same statement before the committee in the presence of the presidents of the three pools, and it was admitted that they had not produced a bill.

Mr. Argue: I am submitting this is the bill that was produced and shown to the committee.

Mr. Speaker: Order. When I asked the hon. member to accept the statement made by the minister he indicated that he was referring to a document and he proceeded to quote from it. Now we are right back to the point which I thought had been settled earlier, before he embarked upon the quotation. He has said that he considers what he has read is a bill, whereas the minister says he has not received a bill. Perhaps he would argue it is a question of interpretation, but he should not contradict the minister when he says that in his view he has not received a bill.

Mr. Argue: Mr. Speaker, I think there is no argument but that the minister received the document from which I have just quoted,